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Abstract

The vernacularization of international policy involves a highly complicated process of legal and cultural translation. Ethnographic research on the role translation played in the UNESCO World Heritage Site nomination of Catholic churches in Japan’s Nagasaki prefecture illuminates the way existing social hierarchies struggle to maintain themselves in the current tide of globalization. Framed as a universal legal regime with specific policy requirements of enhanced democratic, gender balanced political participation, the Convention nevertheless became a tool for intermediary actors in their attempts to maintain and even strengthen local hierarchies of power. Focusing on the communicative aspects of law in daily practice, particularly the constant interpretation and reinterpretation needed to give contextual, metapragmatic meaning to the words and phrases of the law, reveals layers of multilingual and multi-administrative system vagueness that presents politically informed translation opportunities for chains of actors from national local levels. Legal translation involves not only exuberances and deficiencies between languages but also between regimes of power represented by systems of administrative law and politics.
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Preface

To protect the identities of my informants, I use pseudonyms for the majority of the names of individuals, institutions, and geographic places in this dissertation. I have used the actual names of some public figures, or those that are frequently cited in media outlets. I use the actual names of select locales to establish the general geographic area, but in the interests of protecting the privacy of individuals in the region, I do not explicitly identify which locales are referred to by pseudonym.
Chapter I: Introduction

The Juxtaposition of Convention and Context

Convention is apparent in the fixed materiality of documents, and context is gleaned in a social situation in flux. Where convention and context meet, they produce new forms of meanings. This point is not necessarily an arbitrary collision; it can be created and strategically manipulated by intermediary actors. The central research question of this dissertation asks how intermediary actors place themselves at the juxtaposition of the conventional forms of meanings and contextually dependent forms of meanings: more precisely, how do regional government officials in Japan place themselves at the intersection of an international convention and their local social contexts?

This intermediary place is both an intersection and a juxtaposition. If we take a classic anthropological example of the village headmen in Africa (e.g. Bohannan 1957; Gluckman 1949; Schapera 1938), we can see that they are placed between the colonial authorities and the colonial subjects. At the same time, these two realms are pasted together like a collage. For this reason, I say they are “at” the juxtaposition.

By focusing on Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, I argue that bureaucrats’ “strategy of juxtaposition” (Brenneis 2004: 582) is subtle and pragmatic; it is the process of how they make an indexical connection – in terms of Michael Silverstein’s sense of indexicality (1976) – between layers of legal texts and local social contexts. This is the insight I have gained over two years of observing government meetings, working as an institutional researcher, interviewing local officials and residents,
as well as spending time drinking with them in Santo and in other parts of Nagasaki
prefecture.

I examine how Japanese public officials make use of the indexical aspects of legal
translation to protect their interests in the midst of national administrative reform. Public
officials analyze and select keywords from the World Heritage Convention, attach their
versions of interpretations to those keywords, and attempt to produce new conventional
meanings to those indices. The translation process of an international convention,
including the World Heritage Convention, is an intersecting process of language and
social reality. In the case of Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination process, the outcome
of this intersection is the creation of a new legal representation of the local-global
intersection – the implementation of local heritage preservation ordinances and
ultimately, as some of local actors hope, official inclusion in UNESCO’s World Heritage
list.

In this dissertation, by analyzing the process of indexical connection, I critically
discuss how public officials strategically position themselves in the juxtaposition
between a *universal* language and a local social context in Japan. Building upon the
discussion of indexicality in the field of anthropology, I examine how government
officials and local residents in Nagasaki make indexical connections in multi-lingual
contexts such as English, Japanese, legal (textual), and conversational (pragmatic)
contexts. The process of legal translation at domestic and local levels proceeds to the
implementation of a preservation ordinance or the official nomination to UNESCO’s
World Heritage Committee. It is the process whereby intermediary actors try to navigate
the direction of meaning transmissions for their own benefit while they concurrently
fulfill institutional expectations of national administrative reform. It is the process in which multiple indices in layered legal documents constitute a new context. It is the process in which the indices *transform* a new context rather than simply function as the medium of translation.

*At the Western Border of Japan*

In March 2005, I was on a prop plane, on a Canadian-built Bombardier Dash 8 which was operated by a local non-profit sector company (第3セクター: *dai san sekutaa*), heading to Narae island of the Santo archipelago, a remote island in western Japan. When I was getting onto the plane, I recalled my previous trips on a Bombardier. It was when I was living in Vancouver that I often took the same model to/from Seattle to make transfers to other flights. Heading to a remote island in Japan on this plane reaffirmed to me how this world was so intertwined that I needed to take a Canadian-made plane to travel within Japan. Just as technologies and people move through the world, so do ideas – including the power-laden ideas of policy and law. My journey to Narae was the first step in a project to study the way law moves across national, linguistic, and cultural borders.

It was a cloudy day and I could not see anything from the window of the Bombardier after it took off from Nagasaki airport. Finally, as the plane got closer to Narae island, the view became clearer and a volcanic island came in sight. Santo archipelago is probably one of the least convenient places to travel to from Tokyo. Either

---

1 The non-profit sector or the third sector (*dai san sekutaa*: 第3セクター) in Japanese refers to joint corporations invested in both by the public sector (*kan*: 官) and the private sector (*min*: 民). The most common commercial sector for third sector companies is the public transportation sector, in which the government tries to cut down the tax expenditure by handing the management over to a non-profit company.
at Fukuoka or Nagasaki, travelers have to make at least one layover en route to any of the islands in the archipelago. Quite often, for the second part of their itinerary, travelers choose to take an inter-island ferry which makes the journey at least six hours in total from Tokyo to Santo. Far from Tokyo, Santo is located at one of the geographic peripheries of contemporary Japanese socio-politics.

The objective of this trip was to make preparations for my upcoming field research on Santo. The general research objective was to ethnographically analyze the translation and implementation process of an international policy. As a student of legal anthropology, I had been interested in the globalization of legal regimes, particularly in terms of how those living at the periphery of domestic politics interpreted an international policy and contextualized it to their socio-political sphere. My sense of question on legal translation developed when I was working as a Japanese-English translator in Japan between 2002 and 2005, especially during the time that I worked as an assistant international conference organizer for a grassroots civil rights association in Hokkaido prefecture in 2005. As the chief secretary prepared documents for the conference in Japanese, my assigned task was to translate them and prepare English versions. To make the translated documents sound more natural and more comprehensible for English readers, I took into consideration the linguistic and cultural exuberances and deficiencies which lay between the two socio-linguistic spheres and aimed for a meaning-centered translation above a word-centered translation. How do we substitute ambiguous Japanese expressions into English words and phrases? For example, direct translation cannot convey the message behind an unclear Japanese polite expression of denial. With consideration of a speaker’s intonation, pauses and word
stress, along with cultural background, translators frequently add and omit words and change grammar to make the message more coherent in a translated language.\textsuperscript{2} It was hard for me to adequately express the issues in this process to the chief secretary of the project in Hokkaido. Being monolingual in Japanese, he thought that word-to-word translation without any socio-linguistic modification would be the best way to convey his message to different language spheres.

Along with the traditional question on effective message transmission (e.g. Nida and Taber 1974), one of the critical challenges for translators is how to satisfy clients. Due to the socio-linguistic differences between languages, translators often modify the orders and the structures in the original language to effectively relay the message in other socio-linguistic contexts. However, such socio-linguistic modifications can also be a source of concern for some clients. I recalled that some of my clients, such as the chief secretary in Hokkaido, did not want any socio-linguistic alteration and requested more literal translations with no modification despite the fact that there was no one-to-one correspondence with terms and expressions, so meaning would be compromised. They sometimes expressed their anxiety about not having much control over the details of the translation process. Instead of seeing socio-linguistic modifications as necessary for effective cross-linguistic communication, the clients perceived such actions as message distortions. While linguistic modifications in translation pose a continuing challenge for translators on one hand, the linguistic characteristics of translation may be processes in which translators can, on the other hand, subtly insert their own influence over other people’s communication processes. The insecurity of my clients was rooted in a

\textsuperscript{2} See Becker and Mannheim (1995) for their analysis of the use of linguistic exuberances by Clifford Geertz.
linguistic alienation they experienced when their words went through the hands of a third party. Clearly, power can be a highly salient dimension of the translation process in certain circumstances.

I gained theoretical insights to my personal inquiry on translation in the reoccurring discussion on ethnography and comparative analysis in the field of anthropology (e.g. Merry 2006). Translators, which include any scholars who engage in comparative analysis such as most anthropologists, are often at a point of juxtaposition between their field and their audience. As Paul Bohannan (1969) argued, at such a juxtaposition, anthropologists concurrently engage in two conflicting tasks: trying to minimize the possible distortion of folk concepts, and trying to guarantee maximum audience comprehension. The valuable discussion between Bohannan and Max Gluckman on the use of the terms of English jurisprudence in ethnographic description and comparative analysis foreground an enduring question for anthropologists (e.g. Bohannan 1969; Gluckman 1969): Being placed at the juxtaposition, how do we determine the precision of the translation? How do we select what we see as the core components of an original context? How do we reorganize these core components so that the audience can easily understand? Anthropological inquiry on ethnographic description and comparative analysis corresponds with translators’ dilemmas on the act of translation (see Asad 1986).

However, it is not only professional translators or anthropologists who are placed at such juxtapositions. It is not uncommon for anybody situated between different sets of social circles to face the challenge of such information relays – the challenge of translation. From a circle of coworkers to clients, from a business circle to a social circle,
or even from one group of friends to another, it is a part of everyday communication to interpret, summarize, and reorganize the contents of an original message to effectively transmit it. We frequently attempt to attune to the recipient’s perception by internalizing the dialogism between two different cultural circles (e.g. Arno 2009; Rommetveit 1992). Translation – or transformation according to Michael Silverstein (2003) – is a vital part of our daily communication.

In the current tide of globalization, we are intertwined in interpersonal networks where we constantly find ourselves at local and global juxtapositions of the flows of communication. For example, the implementation of international conventions goes through layers of legal translations, up from and down to, the level of local ordinances. Current business transactions not only require linguistic translations, but also require cultural translations to establish transnational cooperation. In any process of translation, translators – as intermediary actors – engage in both upward and downward translation between the international sphere and the lived contexts of the local residents (e.g. Merry 2006; Riles 1998). Having been informed that the local actors in Santo, Nagasaki, had actively been trying to integrate global discourse into local political economic activities, I hoped to observe the vivid process of layered translations and to analyze how intermediary actors in Japan strategize from the juxtaposition.

While popular imagination, fed by alarming reports (Arno 2009) in the media, often portrays globalization in dramatic terms, the implementation of an international convention, which is one of several aspects of globalization, is a more tedious and subdued process at the local level. Under Japan’s decentralized administrative system, legal translation is the process in which the local public officials, who are the
intermediaries between the convention and the local residents, find common indices in
the ratified international convention and Japan’s domestic legal system, and draft locally
particular ordinances. Without a knowledge of and familiarity with how public officials
recognize indices and how they construct indexical connections between an international
convention and Nagasaki’s local context, it is difficult for local residents to understand
what the indices – the words and phrases – used throughout the drafting process of the
local ordinance mean. This complex process of language and cultural translation is not
merely concerned with crises of transparency and reference, it is also a medium of
strategic action and power.

*Indexicality in a Communicative Context*

To understand the “strategy of juxtaposition” (Brenneis 2004: 582), we must first
briefly turn to the concept of indexicality in anthropological discussions of language and
communication. Since Malinowski’s observation that “the real understanding of words is
always ultimately derived from active experience of those aspects of reality to which the
words belong” (Malinowski 1935: 38), the contextual aspects of language and
communication have been consistent and reoccurring topics in anthropology (e.g.
Malinowski 1935; Firth 1930). Particularly since the 1960s, the anthropological
discussion on language and context was further elaborated with C. S. Peirce’s
examinations on the relationship between signs and representations (1965). Peirce’s
question was: how do signs carry meanings while staying abstract in nature; and how do
recipients connect the ideas in their heads to abstract representation? The range of
recipients’ ideas is context-dependent. For example, when we see white powder placed
on a table without any explanation, we might try to guess about the circumstances related
to the powder. With the knowledge and information we have gained throughout our
experiences, we make a judgment on the nature of the powder. Is it medicine, or a drug?
Is it detergent? Or is it anthrax? Depending on each of our social contexts, we have
different interpretations of the physical presence of the object. The intention and the
message of the person who left the powder are contained in the object. The action of
leaving the powder on the table is connected to the context behind the action. Both the
agent (the sender) and the interpreter (the recipient) attach meanings to the powder based
on their social contexts. By placing the powder (object) as an indexical sign between the
two, they inscribe and interpret meaning derived from each of their respective social
contexts. The focus of Peirce’s argument was on the temporal aspect of signs and the
meanings which could be understood in a particular context in which the signs are in use
(Duranti 2003).

In the communicative context, the meanings of indices are determined in terms of
how actors interact with one another. While the meaning of the powder stays abstract
when there is no additional explanation associated with it, the dialogic interaction
between the sender and recipient can either clarify the message associated with the
powder or assign an unintended meaning – from the perspective of the sender – to the
powder. If we consider the dialogic interaction between the two as a single context, the
meaning of the powder depends on the interactions between the two parties. Yet, at the
same time, the presence of the powder – as an index – influences the dialogic process of
the two parties by being a common object of guessing. Therefore, rather than focusing on
the object itself (i.e. the powder), the sender and the recipient interact with one another
by interpreting the meanings of the object by moving them up to the meta-level. At such a “meta-pragmatic” level, we negotiate the meanings of the index and engage in interpersonal interaction (e.g. Silverstein 1993). Therefore, integrated with the discussion on the dialogic communicative process, which was one of Mikhail Bakhtin’s core arguments (1981), the focus of anthropological discussion on indexicality shifted from the given context to the negotiated context (Duranti 2003: 331). Rather than examining an index in a context, anthropologists’ focus shifted to the use of the index in constituting a new context (e.g. Agha 1998; Gumperz 1982; Labov 1972; Hanks 1990; Silverstein 1976).

Along with the integration of pragmatic and dialogic aspects of communication to the discussion on indexicality, another important development in the indexicality discussion was that the focus started to include the relationship between language and society, or language and culture, e.g. politics, law, gender and identity (e.g. Agha 2007; Arno 2009; Brenneis and Myers 1984; Briggs 1996; Gal 2005; Inoue 2002; 2006). Particularly, the pragmatic aspects of language provided critical insights into the interrelationship between convention and context, the core focus of this dissertation.

*Anthropological Study of Law: Conflict Resolution and Institutional Control*

Prior to the rise of the interest in process, the common concern of legal anthropologists was to observe systems of social control among those who lived in societies without formal legal systems. Initially, out of several approaches, there were two which analyzed the regulatory systems of small-scale societies used for case studies: one examined the functions of social order through conflict and dispute settlements (e.g.
Bohannan 1957; 1967; Gluckman 1955; Llewellyn and Hoebel 1941; Nader and Todd 1978), and the other looked at how law provided avenues of interpersonal communication to become a shared foundation of a community (e.g. Barton 1919; Malinowski 1926). In this paradigm, however, anthropologists sometimes portrayed any form of social control as law (Arno 1985: 41), as if law systematically influenced every corner of a society. Even though, in retrospect, this assumption does not hold – anthropologists influenced by the early paradigm of legal studies challenged the then-predominant discourse of “lawless” societies by presenting the system and complexities of the maintenance of a social order in societies and systems of reciprocity.

However, as the focus of anthropological research on law shifted from the social orders of the communities in former colonies to anthropologists’ own societies with specialized legal institutions such as those of the US, it became less acceptable to treat law as the center of social phenomena. Under the previous paradigm, anthropologists analyzed the pragmatic aspect of law in small-scale communities. As a form of social order, the nature of law in small-scale communities was not fixed, but more contextual. The presence of law was not static, but community members’ actions constantly redefined the particular structure of law. Contrary to the unconventional nature of law in the previous paradigm, as a written form of language, statutes hold less contextual but more symbolic and conventional characteristics in society. Facing a legal document, we engage in interpreting the meanings and applications of the law and negotiations with others. While the definition of law in the previous paradigm was closely related to interpersonal interactions in a community, an institutionalized law is often alienated from a local context. Unlike a pragmatic social order, conventional legal texts often exist
without a particular context and require additional mediation to gain a specific meaning in a particular context.

Therefore, while the anthropological studies of law in close-knit communities gained more attention among American legal professionals during the early post-colonial era, such as the institutionalization of the Alternative Dispute Resolution at the 1976 Roscoe Pound Conference (e.g. Levin et. al. 1979; Merry 1999; Nader 1999), legal anthropologists constantly pointed out the problems with the direct-transplant of a community resolution model into the American socio-legal context (Nader and Grande 2002). In contrast to the high degree of legal consciousness among people in a close-knit community, the law in an urbanized community – or a *loose-knit network*, according to the Manchester School tradition (Colson 1977; Werbner 1984), is highly institutionalized and specialized (Nader and Todd 1978). The more a law becomes institutionalized, the more conventional (or static) it becomes, and the more it becomes specialized, the less interactions non-specialized individuals have with the law. Therefore, rather than directly importing the analytical approach on law in Africa or the Pacific to an American social context, legal anthropologists examined the problems with the conventional forms of laws such as legal fiction (e.g. Nader 1980), legal alienation (e.g. Conley and O'Barr 1998; Merry 1990; Nader 1990), and the regulatory process of law (e.g. Arno 1985; Moore 1978; Riles 1998).

For example, we are often disadvantaged under a law by our unfamiliarity with the layered and complex contexts behind it, or by not having enough access to the information of the law due to the various constraints in our daily activities. Suppose we
are reading the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment to the US Constitution. Without any explanation, what does the term *person* in the section indicate? Does it include any person regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender? By itself, *person*, in the Amendment stays vague. To be well-versed with the precise or pragmatic meaning and the applications of the term, it is mandatory for us to be familiar with related case laws and statutes, the patterns of legal arguments, the patterns of logic construction, the techniques associated with litigation strategies, and the political affiliations of the judges. To understand the pragmatic meaning of a law, it requires a complex and wide range of information. As a law is often removed from our daily activities, the anthropological sense of question on law has shifted more to the issues of the interrelationships between the conventional nature of law and the contextual nature of our daily activities.

*Indexicality in the Legal Process*

Therefore, by focusing on the processual aspects of law, anthropologists started analyzing the processes “in which conscious efforts are made to build and/or reproduce durable social and symbolic orders (Moore 1978: 6).” This process becomes more apparent in the interactional and socio-linguistic aspects of law and in our everyday activities. Given the case law tradition of the Anglo-legal system, both textual and verbal interactions at court are critical parts of the legal process. Court is the place where the actors present their analyses and interpretations of law, attempt to apply their

---

3 “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

4 For example, Civil Rights Cases, 109 U.S. 3 (1883); Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896); Buchanan v. Warley, 245 U.S. 60 (1917); Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), and one of the most recent cases, Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 130 S.Ct. 876 (2010).
interpretations to disputed contexts, and establish precedence for future cases in institutionalized regulatory measures, case law. Inheriting the lineage of the studies of conflict and resolution, the interactional processes at court have become one of the major fields in the anthropological study of law. Anthropological research on court disputes includes examinations of the effect of proceeding cases on the court processes and the patterns of judges’ decisions (e.g. Merry 1990; Philips 1998), the effects of expected communication/processual formats – control communication according to Arno (1985: 42-50) – in courtroom (e.g. Conley and O'Barr 1998; Matoesian 2001), and the discursive intersection of native tradition and judicial process (Richland 2008).

As the anthropological analysis of judicial process developed, it incorporated theoretical and methodological approaches from linguistic anthropology; anthropological analysis of law and language thus broadened its sphere of legal anthropology to contemporary issues such as ethnographic analysis of the globalization of legal regimes. For example, along with other anthropological analyses on the process of globalization and law (e.g. Bowen 2005; Coutin 2003; Hirsch 2006; Lazarus-Black 1994; Maurer 1997), Annelise Riles (1998) analyzed the process of writing an international convention. Riles examined the negotiating and drafting process of how the delegates of each country and NGO members discussed and selected words and phrases to produce a legal document of “universal rights” at a UN-sponsored international conference. In the process of producing a “concrete” legal document, Riles’ ethnography shows that the primary focus of the delegation and the NGO members was the patterns of language use in the document. To make the language in the document more inclusive, the moderators put all the proposed language in a “bracket,” and engaged in lengthy discussion until they
could find terms that would allow delegates to come to a consensus (Riles 1998: 389). The phrases in a finalized international document are abstract representations of reality which encompass an “infinite amount of texts or labor that text or labor concealed” (Riles 1998: 388). At the same time, as abstract and inclusive as they are, the finalized legal documents are less contextual and ironically often alienated from the local level.

While Riles ethnographically observed the legal process of transformation from local to global, Sally Merry analyzed (2006) the process from global to local, the vernacularization of global legal regimes, by following the spread and the application of human rights discourse. In her multi-sited ethnography, Merry examined the formation process and vernacularization process of the transnational human rights regime to specific regions, such as Hong Kong, Fiji, and India. In her research with bureaucrats, local and international activists, and NGOs, Merry argues that the most effective way to make international human rights law effect the level of local practice is to frame it in local terms rather than to directly impose the language of the international sphere.

**Legal Translation in Japan**

Building on those preceding anthropological analyses on language and society and language and law, I examine the translation process of UNESCO’s World Heritage program at the municipal and local level in Japan. The World Heritage nomination process, including that of Japan, is the process in which involved actors engage in countless communicative interactions in institutionalized environments. Individuals from a variety of institutional affiliations, such as the local residents and the officials from several branches of municipal, prefectural, and national administrations, interact – both
directly and indirectly – with one another in-between UNESCO and the local spheres of Santo and other parts of Nagasaki prefecture. Those actors in the nomination projects engage in interactive communication both through documents (textual/conventional channels), verbal interactions (pragmatic channels), and visual mediums (e.g. zoning maps). Comparing the sentences and the phrases in the World Heritage Convention with each social context, the actors in Nagasaki’s nomination project come up with their interpretations of the Convention and analyze how they articulate the Convention in each of their ongoing social contexts.

The reason why I chose Japan’s World Heritage nomination project as the case study for this project was originally rooted in my question on academic and popular discourse of Japan’s hybrid socio-legal characteristics. Legal scholars such as John Haley (1987; 1991) and Mark Levin (2009) examined the process of Japan’s legal hybridization by tracing the historical events of how Japanese society responded to the importing of foreign legal systems. Having Chinese influence in the earlier formation of the bureaucratic system, the Japanese model of governance developed its own characteristics by incorporating multiple western legal traditions such as German, British, French, and Anglo-American (Maruyama 1983). Even though those preceding studies on Japan’s legal hybridization focus on the longer chronological historic span, the hybridization of legal systems is a constant ongoing phenomenon (e.g. Iwasawa 1998; Owada 1999; Port 1991). My sense of question on the discourse of the hybrid characteristics of the Japanese legal system has developed since the time that I learned that Japan ratified CEDAW (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women) in 1985.

---

5 For example, Levin (2009) uses a soup preparation metaphor to explain the historic process of Japan’s legal hybridization (2009: 317-319).
Even though the Japanese national government ratified CEDAW and made revisions in their Equal Opportunity Employment (danjyo kikai kinto ho: 男女雇用機會均等法) in 1999, it was (and still is) not difficult to come across unequal treatment of women in various contexts in Japanese society. If CEDAW has been integrated as a part of domestic legal system, why is it still institutionally allowed for the Japanese public administrations and private companies to exercise the Japanese sense of (what I call) macho-sexism that is manifested, for example, in the limiting of female participations in their organizations (e.g. Ogasawara 1998)? It seems more than just simply concluding that gender discrimination is a part of Japanese legal characteristics (or as the scholars in Chinese studies would joke as the gender equality with Japanese characteristics). In the translation process of the Convention, it seemed that there were some “conscious efforts” (Moore 1978: 6) made to retain gender inequalities even after ratification of CEDAW. As Andrew Arno stated that “[the broad problem] in legal anthropology is to understand the maintenance of inequality” (Arno 1985: 40), I found that the translation process of an international law in Japan would be a fruitful subject to ethnographically examine in terms of how intermediary actors attempt to maintain existing social hierarchies and inequality under the period of structural reform.

The Field Site: At the Juxtaposition of Local, National, and Global

In 2003, The Japanese national government made the World Heritage nomination project one of signature projects of their national administrative decentralization (Government of Japan 2003). In September 2006, instead of unilaterally selecting
tentative World Heritage properties, the Japanese national Agency for Cultural Affairs (bunka cho: 文化庁) sought applications from prefectural and municipal governments to voluntarily nominate national tentative World Heritage properties. The national government advertised this nomination method as more of a means to reflect the opinions of local level actors and to encourage community participation (ACA 2007).

The field site, Santo archipelago, was not only far from the four major Japanese islands, but several local social practices also seemed different from those of other major Japanese islands. It was almost mandatory to commute by boat around the archipelago, stray cats seemed to be more dominant inhabitants than the humans in several districts of the islands, and the local commercial districts were depressed with not a few local

Figure 1: Common maritime transportation in island communities of Nagasaki: [Top] Islanders use an ocean taxi (kaijo takushi: 海上タクシー) either for rapid commute or to get to relatively remote communities, and [Bottom] the inter-island ferry is cheaper and a popular form of public transportation.
retailers out of business (Figure 1). Around the islands, the socio-economic depression of
the islanders was tangible. Over the past four decades, the island youth had moved out
from the regions either to get higher education or to search for better economic
opportunities, and some of the residents referred to their island as filled with genkai
shuraku (限界集落: marginal hamlets). When a local contractor was demolishing an
abandoned house, he was complaining to me that he had to initially engage in disposing a
corpse of a stray cat beneath the house before starting the actual demolition. Several local
schools closed and had merged due to the decreasing numbers of children in the
community. There were abandoned grade school facilities around the island, and local
news reporters covered stories of school closures at the end of every calendar year. As
Santo was located at the geographic periphery of the Japanese socio-politics, the local
residents also identified with the discourse of periphery, or the discourse of the vanishing
(e.g. Ivy 1995).

The irony of this border archipelago was that it was located right across from Jeju
island, an autonomous political and economic region in South Korea’s political system.
Although Jeju was also located in the geographic periphery of a nation-state, it had
gradually established a unique position in the international global political economic
system. Since the end of World War Two, Jeju and Santo have not officially been
connected via direct sea or air routes. As Santo faces the economically-booming island
over the East China Sea, islanders expressed their anxiety of being placed at the
periphery of both the domestic and global political economy. More ironically, one of the

---

6 Sociologist Akira Ohno proposed the term *genkai shuraku* in 1991 to indicate hamlets in which more than fifty percent of the inhabitants were older than 65 (Ohno 2006).
most visible effects of globalization in Santo can be seen around the shores of the island.

Unlike Jeju, which has many international travelers, Santo residents experience globalization washing ashore in the shape of a variety of trash drifting in from the ocean – five-gallon plastic bottles with hazard warnings in Korean, empty bottles of sports drink with simplified Chinese characters, and even bottles of men’s Nivea deodorant from Russia (Figure 2). The influence of globalization was visible in Narae, but mostly in the form of trash. The residents in Narae wanted to reposition their city from being a global maritime trash center (at the periphery of the Japanese domestic political economy) to a global/domestic economic core.

One way the residents and the officials in Goto, one of the districts in Santo, thought they could gain global recognition was through international events. They had had a decade-long discussion on an international sports event, the Ironman Japan
triathlon which the district annually hosted between 2001 and 2009. Both among the proponents and the opposition, the local residents perceived globalization as a less alienating phenomenon, rather for them globalization was a tool which they could use to address economic depression.

Along with the debate on the Ironman triathlon, I was introduced to another globalization discussion in Santo when Hiroshi, the preservation specialist of the Narae municipal government, took me around Narae and a neighboring island. When he was driving around Narae, Hiroshi intermittently pointed out Catholic churches as we passed them and briefly commented on the neighborhoods. Compared to most areas in Japan, the presence of the Catholic churches on the island was quite apparent in Narae’s landscape. Hiroshi explained to me that this was one of the regions where the Japanese Catholics had settled as a place of refuge during the 18th and 19th century when the rulers of the era, the Tokugawa shogunate, publicly banned Christianity. Many Catholic residents in the island identified themselves as the descendants of the early migrants of the 18th century, and some of them still had family lineage documents. One of the largest religious sects of the world held its presence in the landscape of Narae, the periphery of contemporary Japanese geopolitics.

Interestingly, some of the locals perceived that such a peripheral status was actually to their advantage in the current tide of globalization. For example, as for the Ironman event, because Narae was at the national periphery and it was easier to block the traffic, it was possible to host a day-long sports event. Also, since it was at the periphery

---

7 Ironman Japan was one of the preliminary races for the Ford Ironman World Championship in Kona, Hawaii. The total distance of an Ironman race is 140.6 miles, and the host district had to close off a large portion of the roads for this sport event. Ironman Japan was held in Goto nine times until they cancelled the event less than two week prior to the scheduled event date in 2010.
– according to the national and local officials’ analysis, a unique socio-religious custom, underground Christianity, had been preserved and practiced in Santo (see Chapter III). Therefore, some of the local actors saw the peripheral position of Santo in Japan’s socio-politics as a resource for them in the current tide of globalization.

This preliminary fieldwork in Narae city became particularly fruitful as I talked more with local officials. Local officials in Narae, including Hiroshi, were often cautious about their selection of words and phrases when explaining the position of public administration and the increasing attention being paid to the local Catholic churches. According to Hiroshi, one group in Nagasaki prefecture had been promoting the Catholic churches around the prefecture as a possible global symbol for regional revitalization. While I was enjoying an unbelievable amount of oysters, freshly-caught that morning by one of the fishermen in Kuge island, Hiroshi commented:

_{Ah, there is a guruupu (グループ: group) in this prefecture [Nagasaki prefecture] promoting the Catholic churches around this island as the World Heritage properties. Eeh toh desune, from Narae, some of the people, especially those of the local bureau of tourism, are interested in it. The city [municipal government] is not involved in this. Eeeh, Dr. Mori -- he is a professor of architecture in a private college in Nagasaki city – has been directing this group for a few years by now. I heard that they are currently working to have an NPO (non-profit organization) hojin (法人: corporation) status. They have hosted lecture series [on the World Heritage]. I guess…, they are waiting for shimin no rikai (市民の理解: citizen’s understanding) and funding from the government. [conversation with author, March 15, 2005]_

Throughout our conversation, Hiroshi described the guruupu as being somewhat alienated from the social life of Narae, but managed by a college professor in Nagasaki city. The guruupu was neither public nor community driven, according to Hiroshi. Not

---

8 The discourse of Santo as a peripheral place can be questioned in light of the fact that one of the historic maritime centers, Nagasaki city, is only approximately 70 miles away by boat.
only did the local public sector keep its distance from the group, but the members of the guruupu were also still investing their efforts to gain shimin no rikai (local citizen’s understanding). Hiroshi’s description made me think that the World Heritage nomination was rather an idea of some independent group rather than a grassroots movement.

In addition, even though the local Catholic churches in Nagasaki represented one aspect of global network manifested in the local landscape in a physical way, the actual global network of the Catholic church was primarily rooted in something intangible: members’ religious beliefs and practices. The global network of the Catholic Church is more of a religious and institutional network. As approximately 90% of Narae city residents (approximately 40,000) and 95% of the total population in the Nagasaki prefecture (approximately 1,450,000) were not members of the Catholic Church, it seemed questionable to reposition the local Catholic churches in Narae and the rest of the Nagasaki prefecture as a medium by which local residents would access the global political economic networks (Catholic Bishops' Conference of Japan 2005, also see Chapter III).

Translating an International Law

As my question on the cautious word use of the officials developed while I was preparing to return to Santo for long-term fieldwork, Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project became an official project of the Japanese national government. On January 23, 2007, approximately two years after my initial visit to Santo, the Japanese national government announced the official inclusion of Nagasaki’ss Catholic churches

---

9 In terms of their political landscape, Hiroshi expressed that the local Catholics in Narae held strong political presence by having ten percent of municipal population. [conversation with author, March 15, 2005]
to the national tentative list for future World Heritage nomination. The national
government emphasized the architectural characteristics of the Catholic churches around
Nagasaki instead of the global
nature of the Catholic
institution. According to the
national government, the
distinctive characteristics of
the Nagasaki Catholic churches
were the east-west hybrid
architectural structure (Council
for Cultural Affairs 2007).

While these churches looked
western in appearance, the national government praised the architectural technique as
being highly Japanese. Such east-west hybridity was evaluated as proof of the
local-global linkage in history and as a way to connect the regions in Nagasaki with the
global sphere (Figure 3).

This national announcement marked the official start of the World Heritage
nomination process in Nagasaki prefecture. In other words, it marked an important
pragmatic point in the translation process of local-global connection. Five days after the
national announcement, I noticed a subtle discursive shift in Nagasaki in the labeling of
the guruupu which was previously working to promote the Catholic churches. A local
media outlet in Nagasaki used an opaque Japanese term. The Nagasaki Shinbun (長崎新
聞), the largest local newspaper company in the prefecture, called the guruupu one of the

Figure 3: The Old Gorin Catholic Church on the island of
Hisaka was one of the first Catholic churches in Nagasaki
registered as a national heritage property of Japan in 1999.
The local Catholic parish built another church in 1985, so
Old Gorin Catholic Church, now deconsecrated, has lost its
religious significance but retains cultural value.
local *minkan* (民間) organizations (Nagasaki Shinbun, January 28, 2007). The literal meaning of *minkan* is among (間: kan) the public (民: min), and suggests primarily implies that the group is not a part of the public sector. The term also indicates a variety of non-governmental organizations, such as NGOs, community associations, and even for-profit private corporations. Furthermore, *minkan* also includes quasi-governmental organizations in which the core organizational actors are former government employees. Therefore, the pragmatic application of *minkan* holds a wide range of non-public organizations in its nature. Such a wide deviation of the pragmatic definition of *minkan* surely accommodated some of the characteristics of the *guruupu*.

The most important pragmatic aspect of *minkan* was that the *guruupu* was organized by individuals from a non-governmental sphere, and was not a part of the public administration. The application of *minkan* to the *guruupu* matched Hiroshi’s description of the group. The word *minkan* could mask the discussion on how the *guruupu* lacked the connection to the interpersonal networks in Narae and to other regions of Nagasaki, and how the members were still investing their efforts to establish rapport with residents in the prefecture. Concurrently, the discursive trick – or a “taxonomical” trick according to Jack Bilmes (2009) – of referring to this *guruupu* as *minkan* served to shift readers’ attention away from the detailed position of the organization in the local interpersonal context in Nagasaki. Instead, by using a different taxonomy, *minkan*, for *guruupu*, the attentions of those who were not fully familiar with the background of *guruupu* would be directed to one aspect of the *guruupu*: its non-governmental nature.
In the national announcement, the Japanese government emphasized that the selection method was designed to reflect *chiiki ni okeru gou keisei* (地域における合意形成: formation of the consent of regions) rather than the national government’s unilateral selection (Council for Cultural Affairs 2007). The emphasis of the national announcement lay in their declaration to give up the strong unilateral selection process. Instead, the national office attempted to advertise that the new selection method allowed them to accommodate the opinions from *chiiki* (the opinions from communities around Japan) by asking the regional government to voluntarily submit World Heritage nomination project plans.

While the prefectural and municipal officials were voluntarily preparing their nomination plans, they wanted to promote the image of cooperation between the government and the public, aided by the presence of a *minkan* organization, or a non-governmental organization. Therefore, with such indexical and taxonomical tricks, the proposal writers of the Nagasaki prefectural government directed the attention of the national evaluators away from the fact that the prefectural or municipal officials had not gained much consent from the residents in their administrative jurisdictions.

10 “On the Result of the Research/Discussion by the National World Cultural Heritage Committee” [1 (1) U] published by the Japanese National Agency for Cultural Affairs on January 23, 2007 (世界文化遺産特別 委員会における調査・審議の結果について[1 (1) ウ]). The national government explained that they designed this policy to correspond with UNESCO’s guidelines. In section 1 (1) U of the national announcement, the national government cited Section 64 of the UNESCO World Heritage Operational Guideline of 2005. Section 64 of the Operational Guideline states: “State Parties are encouraged to prepare their Tentative Lists with the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders, including site managers, local and regional governments, local communities, NGOs and other interested parties and partners.”

11 Hiroshi and other officials in Nagasaki called the unilateral action *ippon zuri* (一本釣り). *Ippon zuri* is a popular commercial fishing method in which fishermen catch fish (e.g. bonito, tuna, albacore, etc.) with a rod. As *ippon zuri* requires strong force to pull the catch from the water, the term indicates the determined selection process of and the strong influence of the Japanese national government in the World Heritage nomination process. [conversation with author, September, 2007]
As I made progress with my field research in Nagasaki prefecture, I started noticing the crucial gaps between the social realities in the field and the words in governmental documents. The words and the sentences of the public officials and of the governmental documents depicted some aspects of the social realities in Nagasaki and lacked (and masked) other aspects of the local social realities. By making some discursive shifts, the officials, who were also the translators between UNESCO and the local residents in Nagasaki, started making use of detailed but subtle processes of legal translation.

Research Methodology and Timeline

[Participant-Observation]

The methodological aim of this research was to ethnographically examine the process of the World Heritage discourse in Santo and in the rest of Nagasaki prefecture, in as unobtrusive a manner as possible. To locate myself in the translation process of the World Heritage Convention in Nagasaki, I found it was most effective to set participant-observation as the core methodological approach for this study. More specifically, as a participant-observer, I gathered a large portion of research data from working as a municipal technical assistant (October 2007 – August 2008) and a municipal landscape preservation researcher (April 2010 – March 2011) of Narae municipal government, as well as serving as a historic archive committee member of the local Catholic parish of Santo (September 2007 – June 2008).12 Placing myself in a local municipal hall, I was able to observe the process of the communication flow of the public

---

12 For this dissertation, I do not directly use the data which I collected while I served as a municipal landscape preservation researcher (April 2010 – March 2011), but I used it to shape the general framework of this dissertation.
administrators on the World Heritage nomination process. The participant-observation approach which I used for this research include engaging in assigned preservation projects and interacting with other officials over the specificities and the directions of the assigned project (Chapter VII), attending and observing both backstage and public meetings (Chapter IV, V, and VI), and analyzing the contents of the administrative documents of the World Heritage nomination projects.

Participant-observation is the most effective method to examine the interactional process of law and society, and law and language. John Conley and William O’Barr argue that a language, rather than being a mere instrument, is the medium in which law operates, and anthropologists’ insights in linguistic aspects of law allow us to see the dynamic interaction between law and peoples’ everyday practices (Arno 1985; 1993; Conley and O’Barr 1990; Merry 1990; Mertz 2007; Nader 1990). Similarly, law is not only an instrument but a medium of experiences of a “mediator” in Bruno Latour’s sense (Latour 2010). To document the dynamics and the details of the linguistic process, it is ideal to observe the discursive practices of the officials and local residents in contexts that are as natural as possible (Silverstein and Urban 1996).

In this dissertation, I define “natural” in terms of how my presence in the physical space would have as little influence as possible on the discursive environment of Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project. In public meetings, officials exchange conversations having observers, including journalists, in the meeting room. The speakers’ discursive manner is not fully natural in the sense that they usually “control” their communication patterns according to what they think of as appropriate (Arno 1985). Some speakers limit the focus of their conversation by aiming to appeal to outside
evaluators or third parties (e.g. Conley and O’Barr 1990; Philips 1998; Richland 2008). Others adjust their speech manners by considering the socio-cultural composition of their audience (e.g. Arno 2003; 2009; Brenneis 1987; Duranti and Brenneis 1986). Therefore, the speech behavior of the officials in this dissertation is not natural in the sense that all of them restrain themselves by engaging in what Arno termed “control communication” (1985: 43). For example, as a discursive environment, a public meeting is already so unnatural that individuals usually feel intimidated to speak while being observed by their peers in the auditorium (Chapter VI). The discursive environment is “natural” in the sense that officials plan and host those meetings with/without my presence.

The advantage of conducting participant-observation while working with public officials was not only having access to a wide range of information on the World Heritage project, but also having the opportunities to know the dates of upcoming World Heritage-related meetings and events. In the initial stages of my fieldwork, I often found out about the events a few days later in the local newspapers. After establishing personal networks inside the government office, I used the network for my research scheduling. Interestingly enough, the majority of the information I gathered from the public officials was not confidential. Rather the public administration typically gave notices only a few days in advance so that it was difficult for the residents to be fully notified (see Chapter II and VI).

An institutional review board at the University of Hawai‘i deemed my project exempt in its treatment of human subjects. Going beyond the institutional requirement to inform those in the field of this study, I have also adhered to the American Anthropology Association’s Code of Ethics. Throughout my field research, I additionally adopted my
own requirements to protect my informants, and for this reason I do not clarify the names of true locales from those with false monikers throughout the dissertation.

[Interviews]

Other than the initial stage of my fieldwork between August 2007 and January 2008, I conducted interviews primarily to collect narratives and gather information which I could not gain from the public meetings and from printed documents. Other than a few general questions which I prepared prior to the interviews, I kept the format of the interviews almost unstructured, and let the conversations between myself and the informants flow as freely as they could. Even though the contents of the interviews connected to the issues with Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, the focus of each interview was often a segment of the nomination project, such as issues with existing zoning regulations, local economy (farming, fishery, and tourism), and public construction.

The most fruitful place for me to gain in-depth information was where the officials and the residents gathered: particularly social drinking venues, community kitchens, and weekly recreational sports practices. Concurrently, in those venues, I observed the problem with Japan’s formal bureaucratic processes (see Chapter VII; also, Riles 2004). The social drinking venue was probably one of the best opportunities to gather a wide range of data throughout my fieldwork in Nagasaki. Even though I could not use the majority of the data I gained through social drinking venues, it was in vino veritas (in wine [there is the] truth) or nominyukeshon (飲みニュケーション) in which I learned about the local social relationships.
However, in Nagasaki, most of the social drinking venues were highly gendered for the male community members as for the rest of Japan (Christiansen 2010). I could get critical perspectives from female community members usually backstage of the social drinking venues: in the kitchen. As male community members were happily drinking, their spouses were usually in a different room or in a kitchen waiting to clean up the dishes and to serve as designated drivers for their husbands. Due to my alcohol intolerance (geko: 下戸), I stayed sober during most of the drinking occasions (except for on one drinking occasion), and found myself cleaning dishes with the female community members. The jokes and the critical comments of the female community members became vital to formulate the ethnographic analysis of this dissertation.

[Archival/Document Research]

Along with participant-observation and interviews, archival research at municipal and prefectural offices was a necessary part of collecting official historic narratives and up-to-date information on the World Heritage project and on the related cultural heritage preservation project. I applied the critical view of archival scholars such as T. R. Schellenberg (1956), Richard Cox (2004), and Terry Cook (1992), who suggest that scholars have to take into consideration the historical context and the institutional settings of the archives where they acquire the information. As a part of their institutional sections, the materials in the government archive mainly reflected institutionally validated information. However, as an ongoing project, I could observe the formation of multiple discourses on Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, in the official archives, in the circle of the public officials, and in the circle of local residents. Both
The formations of those discourses took place concurrently and intertwined while I was conducting the fieldwork in Nagasaki.

**Dissertation Outline**

The general outline of this dissertation is as follows. In Chapters II and III, I review the institutional background of Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project. Then, from Chapters IV through VII, with detailed ethnographic analysis, I present how public officials attempt to preserve existing local social hierarchy by strategically locating themselves at the juxtaposition of the World Heritage Convention and the local social context. While the ethnographic contents of this dissertation were primarily limited to public events, this data closely compares and is correlated with archival and interview data collected throughout my fieldwork. The ethnographic segments of this dissertation are “the data of social life plucked from their isolable moments” and “invariably point to lived moments that lie beyond them” (Agha 2005: 1). In other words, I use the ethnographic segments of this dissertation not only to depict the crucial legal juxtapositions of the local and global, but also to examine the relevant contexts.

This dissertation as a whole presents the maintenance process of existing social hierarchy in the current tide of globalization by focusing on the communicative aspects of law in our daily practices. It requires constant interpretation and reinterpretation to give contextual meaning to the words and phrases in law, which has a conventional existence. UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention, which is often treated as a universal legal regime, requires layers of multilingual and multi-administrative translations to have a contextual effect at a local level. This translation process – a transformation process as
referenced earlier – consists of chains of intermediary actors’ meta-pragmatic analysis.

As the language becomes vaguer in each consecutive process of the World Heritage guessing game, it is the intermediary actors who could take advantage of the linguistic vagueness. As a result, an international convention, such as UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention, which is believed to enhance the political participation of wider population, ironically could become the tool for the intermediary actors to maintain (or even strengthen) existing local social hierarchies.
Chapter II: The Neoliberal Landscape

This chapter looks at one specific juxtaposition, and outlines how the contours of the neoliberal landscape have ensured that bureaucrats must take recourse in the manipulation of community participation with respect to administrative reform. The emphasis on grassroots efforts over the past 20 years is related to aspects of Japanese administrative culture and to a reluctance of higher-level governments to bear financial responsibility. By reviewing the development of the political discourses on local autonomy in post-WWII Japan in this chapter, I examine the legal need for public officials to demonstrate community interest and participation in Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project.

I make the case that, through the use of vague terminology and other maneuvers, they linguistically arrange the presence of community participation. The need to justify community involvement significantly rose during the last decade as the Japanese national government (or the majority national party of the time, the Liberal Democratic Party [LDP]\textsuperscript{13}) found their political incentive in support from urban residents and in a neoliberal small government system (\textit{chiisana seifu: 小さな政府}) rather than purely discussing the advantage of increasing the autonomy of regional administration.

Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, particularly during the initial two years 2006 to 2008, well represents how public officials struggled to keep their centralized decision-making political approach by managing the attention of their constituencies away from the focus of their discussion. The officials had formulated such socio-linguistic techniques throughout the construction of their administrative narratives,

\textsuperscript{13}Jimin to (自民党) or Jiyu minsyu to (自由民主党)
and those techniques ultimately constituted a particular administrative culture with which
the officials justify their actions.

The Irony of Community Participation

On January 23, 2007, the Japanese national government announced that they had
started the process to add to tentative World Cultural Heritage properties by
implementing a new nomination procedure. By citing Article II.C sec. 64 of the
Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (WHC. 05/2, 2), by which UNESCO encouraged community participation in the process of
tentative heritage property preparation, the Japanese national government implied that it
was necessary to have an institutional system to accommodate community participation
in the national World Heritage nomination process. Catholic churches in Nagasaki were
the first tentative World Heritage properties recognized following the new national
selection scheme. If the opinions of the local communities around Nagasaki prefecture
had been incorporated for as a part of this national nomination process, this national
announcement would have been reason enough for the residents of the prefecture to
celebrate the success of their community-oriented project.

Despite the national narrative of community inclusion, I did not sense much
enthusiasm from local residents when I started interacting with them in the summer of
2007. There were some banners and posters in public facilities, such as in the local
bureau of tourism, public libraries, city halls, and the prefectural offices, celebrating the

14. “On the Result of the Research/Discussion by the National World Cultural Heritage Committee” (1 (1)
U: 世界文化遺産特別委員会における調査・審議の結果について[1 (1) ウ]). Also, “States Parties are
encouraged to prepare their Tentative Lists with the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders,
including site managers, local and regional governments, local communities, NGOs and other interested
parties and partners” (WHC. 05/2, 2; Article II.C sec. 64).
national selection of the Catholic churches to their tentative World Heritage list (Figure 4). However, outside the physical domain of local public administration, it was almost impossible to find any advertisements on the ongoing World Heritage project even though the government announced it as a community-oriented project. Local residents who were not in public administration or in local leadership positions seemingly perceived the national announcement as unexpected surprise. Many local residents at bars and restaurants explained that they had never even visited or seen the local churches, which supposedly held some significant national (or even international) cultural value.
I wondered if this World Heritage nomination project was really a community-oriented project at the beginning even though the Japanese national government implied that it was. A clue came in an article which was published five days after the national announcement by the largest local newspaper organization in Nagasaki. While the governor of the prefecture was expressing his passion to officially register the churches with UNESCO within three years, the writers of the article provided a critical commentary of Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project:

On the day of the national announcement, while the mayors and the governor issued positive statements on the announcement, there were not many celebratory moves among the residents (jyumin:住民) [in the prefecture]. A member of a minkan organization and the committee chair of the prefectural government, Mr. Yasuhiro Wakita explained, “The major difference of Nagasaki’s [World Heritage] nomination project from the others was that the public administration did not get involved in it. [Mr. Wakita also] stated “Initially, the prefectural and municipal governments could not fully understand the value [of the churches], and there has been the issue of the separation of church and state (seikyo bunri:政教分離),” and the group has led the [initial] World Heritage nomination project in this [Nagasaki] prefecture [instead]. … However, such minkan-led [projects] (minkan syudo:民間主導) have faced limitations in terms of budget and public relations. This resulted in failing to make the [World Heritage] project as a sproject among the residents in the prefecture (kenmin undo:県民運動) (Nagasaki Shinbun News, January 28, 2007: emphasize added).15

Deviating from the narrative of the national government, local newspaper reporters pointed out that Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project had been led by a single group and was not a project that included the majority of the local residents. This article

---

15「同日は関係自治体の首長らの喜びの声が相次いだが、住民による目立った祝賀の動きはなかった。識者や宗教者らで〇一年に結成された「長崎の教会群を世界遺産にする会」会員で、候補入りに向け県などが国に提出した提案書の検討委の座長を務めた脇田安大・ながさき地域政策研究所理事長は「長崎の運動がほかと違うのは、行政が基本的に関与してこなかったこと」と、双方の違いを説明する。当初は自治体も価値を十分理解できず、政教分離の問題もあった」 (一世界遺産にする会)ことから、同会が中心となって進めてきた本県の世界遺産登録運動。…　半面、民間主導で資金やＰＲ力に限界があり、県民運動の盛り上げまで手が回らなかった感は否めない。)
was significant enough in the sense that writers of a regional news organization in Japan subtly criticized the regional public administration.\textsuperscript{16} Furthermore, the article was significant in the sense that the reporters presented paradoxical uses of the Japanese terms (such as \textit{jumin}, \textit{kenmin}, and \textit{minkan}), and provided a glimpse into how the public officials and the local news media had presented the process of the national World Heritage nomination project as if it was not a unilateral governmental project.

\textit{Nostalgic Glory: Japan’s Post-WWII Urbanization of the 1950s – 1960s}

The socio-political foundation of the present discussion on local autonomy traces back to Japan’s symbolic socio-economic shifts in the 1960s. The last two decades have shown an increase in romanticized representations of the “Showa thirties,” which covered the period of 1955-1965.\textsuperscript{17} Fueling a nostalgia for a simpler, more optimistic time, popular media portrayals – which have more currency in cities like Tokyo than they do in rural archipelagos— leave out issues of regional imbalance, the course of which was determined by the growth of industries in urban areas and the subsequent weakening of rural autonomy. In Nagasaki, the population of most municipalities in the prefecture started dramatically declining beginning from in supposedly glorious Showa thirties era.

\textsuperscript{16} One of my informants who was an editor of a smaller newspaper company, repeatedly commented that it would not be easy for regional news organizations to directly criticize the public administration. According to this editor, to compete with the national news organizations, the relative advantage of regional news organizations highly depended on gathering information from local public administrators. The information from the local public officials was not only their major news source, but also the major financial resource for the regional news organizations. Therefore, the editor implied that it was extremely important for the local media outlets not to lose their governmental contacts by self-censoring their contents. Thus, the censorship was less authoritative but more voluntary to keep the income base of the news organization [conversation with author, December 16, 2007].

\textsuperscript{17} To better reflect the Japanese understanding and for ease of use, I will henceforth use the term “Showa thirties” rather than say “the fifties and sixties.”
Following two economic booms\textsuperscript{18} after the end of WWII, Japan’s average economic performance not only recovered from war, but also started building a presence in the international political economic sphere in the latter half of the 1950s. The average gross domestic product [GDP] growth between fiscal years of 1955 and 1960 marked 8.9 percent, while the GDPs of fiscal years 1959 and 1960 were over 10 percent (Table 1). It was this period when televisions, washing machines, and refrigerators were called the \textit{sacred regalia} (三種の神器: \textit{sansyu no jingi}), representing new consumerism and wealth among the public (e.g. Varley 2000: 334). This rapid economic growth became Japan’s drive to be a leader in international relations. It was during this period when the world’s tallest single standing structure of the time, Tokyo Tower (332.5m: 1,091f), was built, when Tokyo won the bid for the 1964 summer Olympics in 1959, and when the population density of Tokyo and other Japanese urban cores began to rise with an influx of new residents from the rest of the nation. Such a rapid post-war recovery directed the

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Jinmu Keiki} (神武景気: 1955 - 1957) and \textit{Iwato Keiki} (岩戸景気: 1958 - 1961)
lifestyle of urban Japan to their version of the swinging 60s – particularly 1964: hosting the summer 1964 Olympics in Tokyo; the inauguration of the Shinkansen (東海道新幹線: the bullet train), the world’s fastest train service with 240km/h (130mph), was portrayed as the superiority of the nation’s technological innovation; and international travel became an option for the Japanese when the Japanese national government started allowing all citizens to obtain a passport (Yano 2009). Each of the icons symbolized the revival of national pride, and was seen as the beacon of the Japanese Economic Miracle that continued until the burst of the Bubble Economy in the early 1990s.

Such glorious images of the 1950s and 60s – or Showa Sanjyu Nendai (昭和30年代: the third decade of the Showa period) – are currently portrayed nostalgically during the ongoing long-term recession, and hold both commercial and political influence in Japan. At the dawn of Japan’s Economic Miracle, the image is that natural environment was still untouched, food was simple and everyone was healthy, knew their neighbors and city was safer. The contemporary popular portrayals of Showa Retoro (昭和レトロ: Showa Retro Style) or Showa Nosutaruji (昭和ノスタルジー: Showa Nostalgia) are filled with the memories of the times when Tokyo was becoming a leading global city but there were still good old Japanese community values in the midst of the rise. Hayao Miyazaki’s animation film, My Neighbor Totoro (となりのトトロ: tonari no totoro), which portrayed the imaginary “natural” rural Japanese landscape of the pre-Economic Miracle period, has been one of the most popular Japanese animation movies and DVDs since 1988 (e.g Yano 2002). The popular nostalgic representation of an imaginary heartwarming Tokyo community life of the Showa thirties in the film, Always Sunset on Third Street (ALWAYS 三丁目の夕日: Always: San-choume no...
Yuuhi) of 2005 was not only became a long-running movie, but also even referenced as the symbol of Japanese beauty in former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s propagandistic book, Toward a Beautiful Nation (美しい国: うつくしいきん) (Abe 2006).


Whether a nostalgia for the old time values or a memory of Japan’s glorious success, such typical nostalgic images often compose the view of residents in urban Japanese cities such as Tokyo, Osaka, and Fukuoka which hold over 75% of the nation’s population. As Japan was heading in the direction of the Economic Miracle, it was a time when the economy demanded a centralized labor force in Japan’s urban cores. Rural Japan responded to the demand from the urban cores not only by supplying commodities,
but also supplying human resources (Table 2). As Tokyo became the first metropolis in the world to hold more than one hundred million residents, this rapid domestic migration led to the creation of suburbs and *new towns* (ニュータウン) (e.g. Robertson 1991).

However, while such successful stories of the 1960s became the foundation of Japan’s post-WWII nationalism, this rapid economic boom also was associated with several social problems not only in urban cores, but also around rural Japan. While Japanese factories developed and produced the latest technological inventions to the world, corporations took advantage of the unregulated environmental measures and caused major air and water pollution around Japan (e.g. the mercury poisoning in Minamata and Niigata, the sulfur and nitrogen dioxide air pollution in Yokkaichi, and the cadmium water poisoning in Toyama) (e.g. George 2001; Upham 1987; Walker 2010).

While the population densities of Tokyo and other urban cores rapidly went up, residents suffered from inappropriate environmental management of cities, manifested in water, air, and noise pollution (e.g. Kidder and Miyazawa 1993). Lastly, urban factories and retailers enjoyed a flood of cheaper labor composed of those who moved from rural towns right after graduating from their middle schools (*shudan shushoku*: 集団就職), the majority of whom could not enjoy the benefit of life-time employment (*shushin koyo*: 終身雇用) (Kase 1997). The urban corporations could also take advantage of unregulated gender discrimination by hiring women in cheaper and uncompetitive salary.

Such social problems in the 1960s are selectively filtered out of Japan’s contemporary popular media and consumer culture to keep Showa Nostalgia a glorious and uncritical happy good feelings.
However, while Japan’s groovy 1960s remains beautiful and glorious in nostalgic conceptions, the social problems of this period paved the foundation of contemporary problems. Social capital, such as human resources, the labor force, and popular culture, continued to move to the nation’s core cities and regional centers and establishing its presence in global economics; this urban growth or urbanization was done so that the cities in a higher position in the urban hierarchies literally “sucked up” the social capital from the towns and villages in the lower positions of the urban hierarchy. For example, the population percentage of the prefectures in Tohoku (東北: northeast) and Kyushu (九州: southwest) regions started decreasing in this glorious and nostalgic 1950s and 1960s (Table 2). Such flows of social capital helped increase the political influence of Japan’s urban cores over declining peripheries including most parts of Nagasaki prefecture. Nagasaki city and Sasebo were the exceptions to this trend of decline in Nagasaki, as they are the two regional cores in the prefecture; Nagasaki city was the only official international port of the pre-modern period and has long been the one of the centers of Mitsubishi conglomerate, and Sasebo is the center of the Japanese and US naval forces.

*Side Effects of Urbanization: More Centralization and Corruption*

While such rapid flows of social capital to Japan’s urban cores made it a global superpower, it concurrently strengthened Japan’s then-existing centralized socio-political hierarchy. Even though one of the emphases of Japan’s post-WWII administrative reform was the decentralization of governmental autonomy (e.g. replacing the nationally-appointed governors with publicly elected leaders), the national government
still took advantage of the newly-implemented democratic socialist state structure to keep administrative power over prefectural and municipal governments. One of the distinctive democratic socialist characteristics of Japan’s administrative system of the post-WWII era was the national tax redistribution system. The official purpose of the Local Allocation Tax Act (地方交付税法: chiho kofuzei ho) was to secure the basic operations of prefectural and municipal administrations for residents by nationally redistributing the national tax revenue (Dewit and Steinmo 2002). Ultimately, such financial security was officially perceived not only as securing citizens’ social welfare, but also as affirming the foundation and integrity of regional autonomy. As urbanization progressed and the tax revenue of the rural municipalities declined, this tax redistribution system was partially seen as a way to ensure the functioning of fundamental governmental and social infrastructure of rural municipalities.

However, instead of securing regional autonomy, the actual result of this tax redistribution system was rather the opposite: it recognized a greater level of national governmental authority over prefectural and municipal governments. Decisions about where and how to allocate the pooled taxes were in the national government’s hands. The weight and the amount of tax redistribution was calculated based on a set mathematic formula with equation constants such as land size, population density, and projected population increase (and decrease) (e.g. Hayashi 1987; Hayashi 1995; Nakai 1988a; 1988b). It was and is a source of uneasiness for municipal and prefectural administrations to always have the national government determine their budget allocation. Often, regional government officials worry over the prospect of unexpected reductions of tax allocation when they have policy disagreements with the national government (e.g.
Such fears among prefectural and municipal government officials grew as they struggled to maintain the populations of their administrative jurisdictions. The officials of depopulating prefectures and municipalities consequently did not often challenge higher administrative layers (national or prefectural), and ironically they became subject to the de facto control of Japan’s centralized governmental system, in which the central control of financial capital overwrote the legally established regional independence.

Moreover, public officials were managing not to confront the national administration and maintaining a relationship with the national administration and Japan’s long-term majority party, LDP, which became a rational approach both for the administrative and legislative branches of regional government. Former national bureaucrats often gained their support from the LDP and became publicly elected leaders of regional public administrations (e.g. governors and mayors) and members of both national and regional legislatures. These politicians portrayed their experience in the national administration and LDP or their *kone* (コネ: connections) as an asset for securing jobs and revenue for their supporters in their voting districts. The purpose of many public projects, particularly public construction, became more about gaining political incentives than actually about achieving the stated socio-technological purpose of the projects (e.g. Ramseyer and Rosenbluth 1995; Woodall 1996).

As towns and villages continued to lose their residents and their tax base, nationally-funded projects such as public construction or agricultural/fishery subsidiaries became primary economic basis for the depopulating municipalities and rural districts, and increasingly raised regional government’s dependency on the centralized government
system. At the same time, national funding projects also functioned as a political gold mine for Japan’s politicians and the public officials (e.g. Culter 1999; Woodall 1997). In exchange for jobs and financial opportunities from the public sector, pressure groups (e.g. construction companies, agricultural cooperatives, and labor unions) reciprocated with firm political support for their local LDP representatives (e.g. Ramseyer and Rosenbluth 1995). The increase of public services and public funding can often function to stimulate a depressed economy and to statistically help raise Japan’s national GDP while accumulating debts in the public sector. However, once public services are integrated into a local political context, the primary function of public services shifts increasingly to the political so that representatives and officials can keep their political base. As a result, those who do not align themselves with the representatives or the officials cannot receive benefits; public services thus function for the public in name only, while serving those of specific local political units. The extreme politicization of public funding projects in this socio-political context then offer examples of corruption rather than public service (e.g. Woodall 1997).

Of primary importance to regional governance then is the avoidance of conflict with national representatives and bureaucrats. Such consensual governance, as John Haley called it (e.g. Haley 1987; 1991), had been a coping strategy for the majority of Japan’s depopulating municipalities; municipalities often put diverse opinions at the local level aside to keep strategic relationships with the national government and national LDP leaders and to meet political and financial needs. Therefore, the irony of Japan’s well-known democratic socialism and utopian conflict-avoiding social model lay in the national government’s subtle but strategic control of prefectural and municipal
governments. The label of this approach, “candies and a whip” (アメと鞭: ame to muchi) – the Japanese version of “carrots and sticks” – neatly summarizes the beneficial and punitive measures that come with centralized financial control.

**Undocumented Rules: Systematic Civic Exclusion**

While Japan’s urban cores were becoming icons of nationalism during the Showa thirties period and would later be symbols of glorious nostalgia, rural Japan was not only dealing with population loss, but also weakening in political autonomy and becoming increasingly dependent on the national government. While officials and legislators were preoccupied with getting more national funding and political support, they often failed to communicate these preoccupations to local residents. As effective management of the needs of the LDP and the administrative budget tangibly became the primary focus of governmental rationale, arranging “proof” of community participation to facilitate the processing of their administrative needs became the core of rational governance over dialogically seeking out the needs of the citizens. Proof of citizen’s presence, or the presence of non-governmental bodies (minkan), was more of a device for officials and representatives to smoothly process their assignments to meet with the expectations of the national sphere. The constant depopulation of Japan’s rural regions from the Showa thirties period ironically strengthened governmental control and more systematically excluded local communities by giving more preferences to a limited sphere of population.

When more tax money is distributed to limited pools of the local population without much community participation or even communication, officials’ and legislators’
political and financial strategies are viewed more as corruption rather than as ideal governance strategies. Joji, serving as a representative of his administrative district (jichikai cho: 自治会長) in Narae city, cynically joked about his experience of growing up and living in Nagasaki’s Narae Island:

Yamada-san, this island is like China. It’s like living in a communist country.19 [conversation with author, July 17, 2008]

Joji grew up in Narae and lived in a suburb of Nagoya for more than ten years before returning to Narae. Instead of talking to me with a Santo accent, Joji talked to me with a fluent Nagoya intonation, acquired while he was living there. Joji’s intention to metaphorically equate Santo’s socio-political system to Chinese communism came from how he viewed the way officials and politicians were handling the flow of information. According to Joji, if he were not a district leader, he could not have access to so much information on governmental projects in this district such as road construction, port development, or educational reform. He perceived that officials and legislators quite often informed their supporters about their projects and arranged them as if they were civic supporters. Joji thought that communist countries always managed to exclude civic voices from the decision-making process, but never failed to arrange for individuals to act as if everybody in the community supported their government. Joji was critical about the flow of information on administrative projects in his municipality. As long as he stayed in a leadership position, the government had to provide him with at least minimally-required information on public projects. Even so, the officials typically provided him with insufficient time to relay information to residents in the district.

19 「山田さん、この島は中国みてえやよ。共産国家に住んでるようなかんじや。」 Right away, I responded to Joji that I thought China was rather an extreme neoliberal country by curbing social services and propagating the ideal of market economy.
Therefore, those who were not in district leadership positions quite often remained uninformed until projects were about to be implemented. Residents were often unaware of many specifics of upcoming public projects when the government hosted public hearings. Thus such hearings consisted of locals who became rather puzzled about the information given about projects and could not easily process the substantial amount of information presented during the meeting (e.g. more ethnographic observation in Chapter VI). However, in administrative documents, such meetings would be processed as proof of administrative information disclosure.

The Place of the Civic in Administrative and Electoral Reform since the 1990s

Therefore, as the rationale among the bureaucrats and politicians of rural Japan was to efficiently process if “administrative needs” and secure of financial resources, such systematic civic exclusion was kept undocumented while Japan’s administrative structure systematically stayed institutionally and constitutionally democratic. In the public sphere, discussion of local autonomy had been a vibrant and enduring topic such as what would be an ideal alternative for Tokyo-centrism (see Nagasu 1980; Matsui 1980; Robertson 1991: 19-25). However, it was not until 1993, the end of Japan’s Economic Miracle, when the discussion on local autonomy became one of Japan’s official national political agendas in Japan. Since 1993, the LDP-SDPJ (Social Democratic Party Japan or nihon shakai tou: 日本社会党) coalition cabinet made securing regional autonomy one of their agenda items, and officially formed a Prime Minister's advisory council, the Committee for the Promotion of Decentralization (chiho
bunken suishi iinkai: 地方分権推進委員会)\textsuperscript{20} in 1995. Discussions among the national committees, administrators, and the members of legislators led to the revision of the Local Autonomy Law (chiho jichi hou: 地方自治法) which the LDP dominant national administration and Diet implemented in 1999, declaring that it would secure the political and administrative autonomy of prefectural and municipal governments.

One of the national government’s core justifications in order to secure and enhance regional autonomy through the implementation of this law was to abolish the kikan inin jimu (機関委任事務), through which higher layers of an administrative offices had assigned their administrative duties to lower administrative layers (e.g. national to prefectural and municipal), but did not allow the elected governors, mayors or legislative members of lower governmental layers to decide how to handle the assigned tasks. For example, in the US, it is rare to observe state or municipal offices serving on behalf of the federal government (e.g. passport services or social security services are either processed at the federal offices in each state or processed via the US postal service); it was (and still is even after the reform in 1999) institutionally common for prefectural and municipal offices around Japan to provide similar services to their citizens on behalf of the national government. It is often in either prefectural or municipal government offices where the residents apply and renew their passports, and pay for and consult about their social security such as their national pension system. In other words, parts of the prefectural and municipal administrations have been, in fact, the divisions of de facto national government, particularly when local administration did not have administrative

\textsuperscript{20} The Committee for the Promotion of Decentralization was a different advisory council from the Decentralization Reform Committee (chino bunken kaikaku suishin iinki: 地方分権改革推進委員会) which served between April 2007 and March 2010 (Government of Japan 2010).
Table 3a: Supreme Court Decisions on Electoral Weight Discrepancy. Conditionally constitutional (iken jyotai: 違憲状態) is a condition which the Supreme Court views as constitutional, but will become unconstitutional without any further measures to address existing discrepancies. In terms of the Lower House election, the Supreme Court decided it was conditionally constitutional when the electoral weight discrepancy was between 1:3 and 1:4 (in 1980 and 1990), and over 1:6 as it was in the Upper House election (1992). In other words, the vote of a person in a rural area could carry 3-4 times as much weight as that of a person in an urban area, but not more. There are two unconstitutional cases in the Lower House elections in 1972 and 1983, of which the electoral weight discrepancy went over 1:4. Even though two cases were found to be unconstitutional, the results of the election were not invalidated to protect public interests (Administrative Litigation Act sec 31:2, jijyo hanketsu: 事情判決) (source: National Ministry of Justice 2010).

sovereignty over these physical spaces in their governmental space. Therefore, the politicians and other proponents of the 1999 Local Autonomy Law viewed the removal of such national services from regional administrations as a means to devote time and human resources back to the hands of the locals, and, ultimately, so that regional governments would be able to serve the local residents more.

Since the implementation of the 1999 Local Autonomy Law, the LDP-led national administration pushed forward administrative decentralization as a part of national administrative reform policy (gyosei kaikaku: 行政改革). Also, as the nation’s
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month, Year</th>
<th>Supreme Court Decision</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>February 5, 1964</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>S38(O)422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>April 25, 1974</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>S48(Gyo-Tsu)102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>April 27, 1983</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>S54(Gyo-Tsu)65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>March 27, 1986</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>S57(Gyo-Tsu)171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>September 24, 1987</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>S62(Gyo-Tsu)14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>October 21, 1988</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>S62(Gyo-Tsu)127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>September 11, 1996</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>unconstitutional condition</td>
<td>H6(Gyo-Tsu)59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>September 2, 1998</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H9(Gyo-Tsu)104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>September 6, 2000</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H11(Gyo-Tsu)241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>January 14, 2004</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H15(Gyo-Tsu)24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>September 27, 2005</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H17(Gyo-Tsu)247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>June 13, 2007</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H20(Gyo-Tsu)209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month, Year</th>
<th>Supreme Court Decision</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>April 14, 1976</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>unconstitutional condition</td>
<td>S49(Gyo-Tsu)75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>November 7, 1983</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>unconstitutional condition</td>
<td>S56(Gyo-Tsu)57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>July 17, 1985</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>unconstitutional condition</td>
<td>S59(Gyo-Tsu)339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>October 21, 1988</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>S63(Gyo-Tsu)24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>January 20, 1993</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>unconstitutional condition</td>
<td>H3(Gyo-Tsu)111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>June 8, 1995</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H6(Gyo-Tsu)162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>November 10, 1999</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H11(Gyo-Tsu)7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>December 18, 2001</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H13(Gyo-Tsu)223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>September 27, 2005</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H17(Gyo-Tsu)71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>October 4, 2006</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>H18(Gyo-Tsu)189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3b: Supreme Court Decisions on Electoral Weight Discrepancy (source: National Ministry of Justice 2010).

Population shifted more to the urban cores, the political landscape of the nation also significantly changed during the post-Economic Miracle period. In 1994, the Diet passed the revised Public Offices Election Act (koshoku senkyo hou: 公職選挙法) to discontinue a single non-transferable voting system (SNTV or chu senkyoku sei: 中選挙区制), in which voters elect multiple representatives from one electoral district, and replace it with a plurality voting system (sho senkyoku sei: 小選挙区制), in which voters choose one representative from their district. This radical shift in the national electoral system was partially meant to respond to the illegality of unequal voting weights between
urban electoral districts and depopulated electoral districts, which was a byproduct of urbanization from the Showa thirties. In this electoral reform, the national administration of the time did re-zoning of the electoral districts allocating more seats to urban areas (Table 3). It had often been argued that the LDP representatives adjusted their political strategies to win their seats through the SNTV system by targeting specific public sectors to direct pork barrel spending for their voting districts (e.g. Ramseyer and Rosenbluth 1995). Therefore, as urban residents’ voting weights went down and rural Japan held more control over national budget spending, the SNTV system became the target of media and public criticism as the structured source of corruption. As the government lost tax revenue due to the long-term recession, both administrative reform and electoral reform was presented to citizens as fair and balanced. While the elimination of institutional preference to rural Japan was portrayed as mandatory to achieving institutional justice, urban Japan started holding their political casting board under the keywords of equal community participation. This paved the way for much more radical neoliberal reform, of which UNESCO’s World Heritage program later became a part.

Change in the Political Landscape: The Push for Neoliberal Reform

In 2002, the Japanese national cabinet, which was led by the former Japanese Prime Minister, Jun’ichiro Koizumi (小泉 純一郎), and his cabinet were in the middle of an administrative and economic reform project. With political support in the urban regions, Koizumi pursued a reduction in the amount of tax redistribution and financial subsidiaries to rural regions from which the LDP had long standing political support.

21 Since the national voting districts stayed the same from 1947 to 1994 even during rapid urbanization, the weight of the rural voters on the national seats were heavier than those of the urban voters.
Along with a variety of privatizations, such as the privatizing postal and banking services (**yusei min-ei ka**: 郵政民営化), the Japan Highway Public Corporation (**doro kodan no haishi**: 道路公団の廃止), and even public post-secondary educational and research institutions (**daigaku houjin ka**: 大学法人化), Koizumi pushed his reform agenda to shift the Japanese national administrative system more towards a *small government* system. Another notable administrative and political change during the early era of Koizumi’s reform was to significantly reduce the budget for public construction. When Koizumi emphasized the reduction of funding for public services and pushed privatization, he portrayed his policies as a fight against corrupt representatives and bureaucrats.

While members of the national cabinet were pursuing such changes in the national administrative system, they also proposed an alternative policy to help reduce the then-existing dependency on public funding. By encouraging the regional administrations to engage in more proactive and self-dependent governance, Koizumi promoted replacing construction dependency with promotion of domestic and international tourism economy. Instead of *building* more public facilities or man-made tourist attractions, national office encouraged the preservation and restoration of cultural aesthetics around Japan, which the national office considered to be the attractions which the international inbound tourists would expect to see and experience in Japan (e.g, Government of Japan, Ministry of Land Infrastructure Transport and Tourism 2002).

By claiming to mainly support *proactive* (**shutaiteki**: 主体的, or **jishuteki**: 自主的) or *motivated* (**yaruki**: やる気) regional administrations, the Koizumi administration narrowed the field of prospective recipients of national funding (e.g, Government of...
Japan, Cabinet Council 2002; Government of Japan, Ministry of Land Infrastructure Transport and Tourism 2002). While such slogans as shutaiteki, jishuteki, or yaruki had somewhat motivating aspects and were portrayed as the slogans of active community participation and a possible increase of regional autonomy, the national office again positioned itself as the evaluator of the efforts made by prefectural or municipal administrations. For officials and residents who had already been proactively managing regionally independent projects, Koizumi’s administrative reform was seen as a new funding resource. Concurrently, the national administration could cut off administrative spending to regional administrations with the institutionally justifiable and catchy sound-bite of regional autonomy. However, for regional officials and rural residents who had been nurtured in consensual governance or harmonious administrative relationship with the national authorities, this reform was perceived less as a securing of their regional or civic autonomy and more as a way to cut support for declining regions off from national political economics by only appealing to demographically dominant urban voters. Therefore, instead of arranging to accommodate effective community participation in their administrative projects, the primary interest of the regional officials, particularly the prefectural and municipal officials in Nagasaki prefecture, was to secure financial support from the national government. As the national administration and Diet passed bills in which community involvement was either mandatory or encouraged during the reforms made throughout the 2000s, regional officials faced the need to prepare some proof of community participation in their projects to minimize actual changes in the regional administration, and to be able to immediately respond to the national calls for administrative reform.  

22 For example, the zoning related laws which were either implemented or revised during this period, such
Implementation of the Landscape Act

In 2002, Japanese national government started including landscape (keikan: 景観) as one of the core focuses of their new administrative policy (e.g. Government of Japan, Ministry of Land Infrastructure Transport and Tourism 2002). The Koizumi administration drafted a new landscape preservation and restoration policy, with the intent to reduce government expenditure on public construction, to reduce
prefectural/municipal governments’ financial dependency on the national budget, and to improve inbound international tourism. Currently, detailed references on landscape preservation and restoration can be found in the documents and the policies of several national administrative agencies such as the Prime Minister’s Office, the Ministry of Land Infrastructure Transport and Tourism [MLIT], the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries [MAFF], the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [MEXT], and the Ministry of the Environment [MOEN] (Figure 5). In July, 2003, in the announcement of the Koizumi administration’s “Beautiful Nation Building” project (うつくしいうにづくり: 美しい国づくり), the MLIT publicly stated their intention to start drafting a national landscape preservation act (e.g Government of Japan, Ministry of Land Infrastructure Transport and Tourism 2003). The Landscape Bill (けikan houan: 景観法案) was approved by the national administrative branch in February 2004, and also approved by the Diet later in the same year. The Landscape Act (けikan hou: 景観法) fully came into effect in June 2005.

When this new national Act passed the Diet in 2004, many environmental activists in urban regions welcomed the Act, but some administrative lawyers questioned the possible social and legal impacts of the Act on rural Japanese communities (e.g. Kitamura 2006). Even though the Landscape Act was designed for a municipal government – or a representative body of local residents – to use (or to draft the details of the actual landscape ordinance), the Act did not have detailed or specific guidelines on how to accommodate community participation in the implementation process and application of the Act. Under the policy, a municipal administration drafts a landscape ordinance, the proposed ordinance has to be reviewed and approved by the municipal
legislature before the actual implementation. Guaranteeing such a checks-and-balances system is a standard institutional framework of a representative democracy. However, such an indirect review system on a proposed ordinance would be of questionable value for residents in districts without representatives on the municipal legislature. For example, in Nagasaki’s Narae city, the municipal administration decided to work on preserving a landscape of an island district from which nobody was serving as a member of the municipal legislature. Other than mandating institutional review by a municipal legislature, the Landscape Act does not require any community participation in the drafting process of a landscape ordinance.

Instead, the Landscape Act provides an alternative path for individuals from the civic sphere to voluntarily propose a landscape ordinance if they gain the approval from at least two-thirds of the land owners in the proposed district. If the majority of local residents can establish a common interest in protecting their landscape, the Act is an ideal tool for citizens to participate in the drafting process of a landscape ordinance. If the residents and governments can shape the contents of the drafted ordinance on realistically equal terms with regard to available information and legal comprehension, the Landscape Act can function ideally both for the residents and the officials. However, this condition is difficult to meet given that the national government already demonstrated an interest in landscape preservation and restoration in their national administrative policy prior to implementing of the Act. On the other hand, local administrations and residents are not only unfamiliar with the Landscape Act, but also unfamiliar with the legal definition of landscape (see Chapter V). Therefore, in terms of actual inter-relational dynamics of the actors in the application of the Landscape Act, national/prefectural/municipal
administrative personnel and residents tend to dialogue on an unequal basis given the imbalance of interests and access to information related to upcoming landscape preservation. In this context, the actual and critical question is whether or not the government can assure enough participation of local residents in the implementation process of the landscape act.

*World Heritage Nomination as a Part of National Neoliberal Agenda*

In his work on the Hopi Tribal Court, Justin Richland (2008) argued that regional (or tribal) public officials often pay closer attention to meeting with the expectations of national officials, and often fail to effectively articulate the national officials’ expectations to the social context of the Indian reservation. The challenges and the difficulties for intermediaries have been a critical focus of discussion among political and legal anthropologists; as mentioned before, the classic example of this discourse is Gluckman’s analysis of the positionality of village headmen in British-colonized Africa (e.g. Gluckman 1949; Philips 1998; Riles 1998; Merry 2003). In Nagasaki, while there is no tribal official or village headman, it is the public officials that fit this intermediary position, and likewise pay heed to the higher-level governmental authorities. They are facilitated in doing so if they are believed to represent constituents without being overburdened. The presence of a *minkan* organization – or a nongovernmental organization (NGO) – in Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination emerged so that public officials could meet with institutional guidelines rather than to truly accommodate citizens’ needs (e.g. Richland 2008).
The national administration announced the new World Heritage nomination process in the midst of such administrative reform on September 28, 2006. Interestingly enough, while the national administration was campaigning for an increase of regional autonomy, the national Agency for Cultural Affairs (bunka cho: 文化庁) gave prefectural administrations only 62 days to file their applications for World Heritage nominations (Agency for Cultural Affairs 2006). As Nagasaki’s officials started tackling the many requirements of their proposals to meet the tight November 30, 2006 deadline, they tried to present their projects as that which would meet with the expectations from the national administration. They were trying to prove that their projects were not solely organized by the hands of the public officials.

Nagasaki officials needed a convenient “gap filter” – typically a spot held by NGOs – between the local administration and residents. While making preparations at the national level for the World Heritage nomination process, government officials emphasized that they were actively working with an NGO that was established by former public officials and company leaders. In this context, the NGO functioned less as a way to bridge the gap between the public administrators and citizens, but rather to fill the gap between the regional public administration and the national administration (e.g. Dicklitch 2001, Henne 2010). In the middle of the national administrative and legislative reforms, government officials in Nagasaki were trying to fulfill their institutional needs to preserve their organizational structure which the government presented as if the newly introduced system was fairer and less corrupt. By managing the timing of information disclosure, meeting procedure, and the wording in administrative documents, officials could meet with institutional requirements while in actuality excluding genuine civic
involvement. The result of such continuous efforts of the regional officials was to manage to preserve the actual organizational structure and members of the regional administration while casting a superficial shell – *administrative reform* – over their administrative practices. It had become standard for regional officials to comply with the national administration (to survive through depopulation, in Nagasaki’s case), and throughout the neoliberal reform of the 2000s, receiving national funding took primacy over fostering or strengthening civic involvement. One of the coping strategies of the prefectural and municipal governments was to present how they proactively complied with the national government’s expectations.

In such an administrative context, Nagasaki prefectural officials found an interest in *Kirishitan* culture and pointed to the presence of the Catholics in the prefecture as a unique characteristic of their administrative jurisdiction, and of a point of interest to draw potential tourists. This draw would also be used as a tool for attention from the national officials, which would enable them to retain sources of national funding and survive the national administrative reform. In the next chapter, I analyze how the prefectural and municipal officials reexamined the value of a local cultural segment of the population and how they attempted to reorganize the historical narrative to meet with the trends of the contemporary political economic discussion. As a result of such narrative manipulation, an unshared identity was going to be presented as a shared one in a neatly crafted governmental document.
Chapter III: Narrative as Mapping

Based on my ethnographic and archival analysis, in this chapter, while I critically review how Kirishitan culture (kirishitan bunka: キリシタン文化) – or the history of Catholicism in Nagasaki prefecture – became a symbol of regional tradition, I concurrently analyze how officials attempted to legitimize a specific discourse on a regional, national, and international level to comply with the demand from the national administration, and how residents in the prefecture perceived such officials’ attempts. It is rather a recent construct to view Christianity as a part of Nagasaki’s regional tradition both by national and prefectural government officials. In the tide of national administrative reform policy throughout the 1990s and the 2000s, prefectural government officials and local elites needed prefecture-wide unifying symbols and selectively reappraised the symbolic value of the Catholic churches scattered throughout Nagasaki prefecture. The officials’ rationale for reconsideration of the use of Catholic history in the prefecture was to have a symbol, one which could represent the entire prefecture, and serve as a marketing tool to promote the entire prefecture as a national/international tourist destination. Their primary interest lay in the possible symbolic function of the public administrative unit rather than in Nagasaki’s actual religious dynamics in which the Catholics only make up approximately five percent of the prefectural population but also maintain clear socio-religious boundaries apart from other residents, as do those of other different religious affiliations. While the prefectural officials and the proponents of the World Heritage projects were passionate about the national selection of the Catholic churches in Nagasaki prefecture, there was tangible discomfort among local residents and municipal officials about the direction of the nomination project.
Kirishitan History as a Governmental Project

On October 11, 2007, I was at the Nagasaki prefectural agency of arts and culture (gakugei bunka ka: 学芸文化課). As I was walked to the office, I was still puzzled as to why officials had referred me to this office. When I was arranging my research contacts with the prefectural government office prior to this visit, I was personally hoping that the officials would refer me to the World Heritage division which, I thought, would directly be working on the World Heritage nomination project. Instead, two days prior to this visit, an official from the arts and culture division had given me a set of brochures which outlined their administrative responsibilities and ongoing projects. I took these brochures as homework from the officials, and reviewed them – taking notes for the upcoming interview. This homework truly challenged me particularly when these brochures were published in 2005 yet did not provide direct reference either to the then-ongoing World Heritage project or to heritage preservation.

Already uncomfortably warm in the elevator of the prefectural office on a muggy fall day in western Japan, I felt even more unsettled and anxious by the fact that I couldn’t understand the official’s intent. While the homework was intellectually challenging to me, it didn’t address my instinctive question: Why did Nagasaki’s Catholic churches become Japan’s national tentative World Heritage properties? Why did the local government officials or any proponents of the project nominate the Catholic churches to the national government? In these homework brochures, there were hints to the questions, and the official made these hints the starting topic of the hour-long interview.
At one o’clock in the afternoon, I arrived at the prefectural office for arts and culture. It was located right next to a major local shopping mall which had a good air conditioning system. I tried to dry off my sweaty shirt, but it turned out to be for nought as I discovered when I arrived at the government office that the air conditioning was turned off as a part of their going green policy (eko undou: エコ運動). There, I met Keiko who previously gave me the homework – only to discover that she had not expected me to read the brochures so carefully.

Keiko was not going to explain to me the background of the then-ongoing World Heritage nomination project, but the background of the prefecture’s Kirishitan culture project. I was wondering what they meant by Kirishitan culture and what it had to do with the prefectural government. Kirishitan is the Japanese phonetic imitation and import of the Portuguese term, cristão (Christian in English), and it obtained a unique and different concept from its English equivalent, Christian. While the English term, Christian, typically indicates individuals with a religious belief or affiliation rooted in any Christian denomination, from Eastern Orthodox to any Protestant denomination, the definition of Kirishitan among the officials in Nagasaki indicates Roman Catholic Christians in the 16th and 17th century, the descendents of Catholics who practiced their faith underground between the 16th and 19th century, and the descendents of Catholics who are currently maintaining underground practices instead of affiliating with the Catholic Church.23

---

23 This definition of Kirishitan differs from the academic definition of Kirishitan among historians. For example, Peter Nosco uses Kirishitan in association with an adjective, Kakure (隠れ or カクレ: hidden), such as Kakure Kirishitan to specifically indicate not only the Christians who went underground during the official persecution period between the 17th and 19th centuries, but also the group of people who continued underground practice after the end of official persecution in the 1870s (e.g. Nosco 1993; 2007). The current
When officials from her administrative division and from the prefectural board of education discussed possible cultural materials for use in developing prefectural-wide heritage tourism and concurrently fostering a prefectural-wide identity, Keiko stated that officials thought that Nagasaki’s Kirishitan culture would not only be unique, but also serve as a symbol of Nagasaki, and a way to market Nagasaki prefecture to the world. In most of the areas within Nagasaki’s political boundary, there are markers or monuments of either Kirishitan culture or history. As it was a project of the prefectural government, its purpose was to create a narrative to cover the entire prefecture by connecting heritage properties around the prefecture with a bridging narrative. Keiko metaphorically described this project as a way to connect the dots scattered around the prefecture with a theme, the dots being Nagasaki’s Kirishitan-related sites and the theme being Kirishitan.

Map 1: The administrative boundaries of western Kyushu region before (left) and after (right) 1872. Nagasaki prefecture was formed as the result of the merger of Tsushima, Iki, and the western half of Hizen.

Japanese equivalent term for Christian is "kurisuchan (クリスチャン)", which is a phonetic imitation of the English term and which is not equivalent to Kirishitan.
culture. As a part of the prefectural government’s “Discovering History and Marketing Project” (Nagasaki rekishi hakken/hasshin project: ながさき歴史発見・発信プロジェクト), the government started allocating part of the budget to the Kirishitan project as a seven-year project beginning in 2005.

From the beginning, Nagasaki prefecture’s Kirishitan project was less about religion, and more political, economic, and geographic. As Keiko indicated, officials were interested in the Kirishitan sites because of the prefecture-wide spatial distribution over the prefecture. Their narrative was not religious, but secular and historic and connected to the political memory of the prefecture. As a political entity, Nagasaki prefecture was established in 1872 as a part of the Meiji restoration government’s administrative reform (Map 1). By abolishing the previous feudal domain system and

Map 2: The fiefdoms (han: 藩) of the feudal lords (daimyo: 大名) around Nagasaki around the time of the Meiji restoration.
replacing it with a more centralized administrative system, the Meiji government aimed to effectively rule the new modernizing nation by re-zoning the boundaries of regional administrations around Japan and directly appointing the governors (*haihan chiken*: 廃藩置県). Nagasaki prefecture was formed as an administrative unit in 1871, by combining multiple preexisting feudal domains such as Saga (佐賀藩), Shimabara (島原藩), Omura (大村藩), Hirado (平戸藩), Fukue (福江藩), Tsushima (対馬藩), and Nagasaki (長崎), which was under the direct control of the Tokugawa Shogunate (Map 2). It is important to understand that as a single political entity, Nagasaki only has approximately 130 years of history.

As the Japanese national government started reducing budget allocations to regional administrations from the 1990s and started pressuring regional administrations to be more self-sufficient, some prefectural administrations perceived that it was necessary to find an ideal narrative to support their presence as a political unit. Keiko thus explained that it was part of the prefectural government’s plan to use heritage properties all around the prefecture and to provide a narrative through which the local residents could associate themselves, and in which residents in the prefecture could identify as the treasure of their hometown, *furusato no takara* (ふるさとの宝) (conversation with author, October 11, 2007). Given that only approximately five percent of Nagasaki prefecture’s population is registered with the Catholic Church and only a few of *Kakure* Kirishitans, who still maintain their underground practices, have come out to the public, how did Kirishitan culture become the narrative used to support Nagasaki’s political-historic legitimacy? Keiko and other prefectural officials’ justification lay primarily in Kirishitan historio-geographic characteristics.
Tracing the Footsteps of the Early Kirishitan History

The narrative of Nagasaki’s Kirishitan history typically starts with the arrival of the Jesuit missionary, Francis Xavier, to Japan in 1549 and with the initial forty years of Jesuit missionary presence in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. During this century, several feudal lords ruled different areas of Nagasaki, and competed with one another for stronger political presence in the region. The arrival of the Portuguese on Tanegashima Island (currently in Kagoshima prefecture) in 1543 and the arrival of other European ships marked the start of the medieval maritime trade – Nanban Trade (nanban boeki: 南蛮貿易) – articulated and intertwined with Nagasaki’s feudal rivalries. The then-ruler of the Hirado domain, Takanobu Matsuura (松浦隆信) was interested in making profits from trade with the Europeans and the Chinese, and became one of the earliest lords to take advantage of the new international trade networks (Lach 1965). It was Takanobu’s plan to gain political strength to compete with and eventually conquer other feudal lords in what later became the contemporary prefectural boundaries of Nagasaki and beyond. This turned out to be a successful plan to retain the Matsuura family’s political influence over northern Nagasaki. In such a political climate in 1550, Xavier arrived at Hirado, and Takanobu became the initial patron of Xavier and succeeding Jesuit missionaries (Boxer 1967).\textsuperscript{24}

Takanobu and his successors integrated international trade as a part of their governance by allowing traders and missionaries from Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, England, and China to use Hirado as their port of entry to the rest of Japan, while

\textsuperscript{24} Prior to his visit to Hirado, Xavier initially arrived at Satsuma province in 1549.
other feudal lords were also seeking ways to establish international trade partnerships (Map 3). The control and the maintenance of the trade partnership was highly political and competitive, even though Takanobu wanted to fully control Japan’s international trade networks in this era. A difficulty could jeopardize an established trade partnership, so competing feudal lords frequently took advantage of any negative factors (map 4). In Hirado, the doubts and distrust between the local and Portuguese merchants over their silk trade triggered the Miyanomae Incident (miyanomae jiken: 宮ノ前事件), in which Japanese merchants killed fourteen Portuguese traders in 1561. This incident led the Portuguese to look for a safer port for them to continue trade and missionary activities. The Portuguese and the Jesuits contacted the feudal lord of a neighboring domain,
Sumitada Omura (大村純忠), to ask for permission to use Yokoseura (横瀬浦).\footnote{As of 2011, while Yokoseura serves as a fishing port for local fishermen, a large part of it currently under the control of the US Naval Force as their fuel supply port.}

Sumitada not only approved the use of Yokoseura for the Portuguese, but also allowed the Jesuits to use the port for their missionary activity. While Takanobu of Hirado un成功fully attempted to bring the Portuguese traders back to his domain, in 1580, Sumitada even ceded to the Jesuits a part of his territory and a port, which is the current city center of Nagasaki (e.g. Turnbull 1998: 27-54).\footnote{Even though the Portuguese left Hirado, Takanobu still kept his trade ties with the Spanish, the British, the Chinese and the Dutch until the Tokugawa Shogunate banned domains to officially engage in international trade in 1641. Sumitada was the first Japanese feudal lord who officially covert to Catholicism in 1563 in Japanese history. Also, Sumitada’s nephew, the lord Harunobu Arima of the Arima domain converted to Catholicism and ceded part of his territory (current Uragami district in Nagasaki city) to the Jesuits in 1584.}

When a ruler of feudal Japan, Hideyoshi Toyotomi (豊臣秀吉), banned Catholic missionary activity in Japan in 1587, he acquired the Jesuit territory in Nagasaki in 1588 as his direct-ruling international port of trade (tenryo: 天領); the port later functioned as one of two official international trade areas until 1856, for the remainder of Japan’s feudal era.

The Jesuit missionaries moved from Hirado to Nagasaki as a strategic way to continue their missionary activities throughout the feudal political power plays taking place around the current political boundary of Nagasaki. Although there is a political history and memory in Nagasaki prefecture, there was no single political entity between the 1550s and the 1580s that could correspond with the current administrative body of the prefecture. Other than a few areas between Hirado and Nagasaki city, there is not much historic continuity of Kirishitan history from the 16\textsuperscript{th} century to the present-day.

The reevaluation of the Jesuit missionaries’ footsteps was a result of the political demands of the prefectural officials of contemporary Nagasaki. Historic events were
revised and reconstructed to meet contemporary political economic demands. That was what Keiko mentioned as *suto-ri-ka* (ストーリー化: to make a story) of Nagasaki’s Kirishitan history to foster a shared regional identity in Nagasaki and to concurrently build a route of such historic sites for tourism development. While the early footsteps of the Jesuit missionaries covered approximately half of the land surface of Nagasaki prefecture, prefectural officials also used a narrative to connect the rest of Nagasaki prefecture through a reappraisal of the history of persecution and through the spatial distribution of Kirishitan-related places.

_Reevaluating the History of Kakure, the Underground Christians_

Following the historic narrative of the beginning of Catholicism in Japan, what the prefectural government officials viewed as the most important part of their Kirishitan project was the history of Kirishitan persecution and the spatial distribution of the places that Catholic converts in Nagasaki conducted underground religious practices. As the feudal lords around Nagasaki competed for access to international trade partnerships, the management of international trades and contacts also became a focus of effective governance strategy among the rulers of feudal Japan. Right after Hideyoshi expanded his political domination over Kyushu region and became the ruler of feudal Japan in 1587, he not only issued an edict the same year to expel Catholic missionaries, but the following year he also seized Jesuit territory in Nagasaki to control international trade activity (e.g. Jansen 2000).

Since then, while the port of Nagasaki, the current center of Nagasaki city, flourished as one of a few official international ports and as the gateway of Western and
Chinese knowledge and technologies (up until the present day as one of the core headquarters of Mitsubishi), the Catholics in Japan started facing persecution from Hideyoshi and the Tokugawa shogunate, the succeeding feudal ruler of Japan. As Hideyoshi and the succeeding Tokugawas issued three major edicts to ban Christianity (in 1596, 1612, and 1614) and restricted maritime activities in the domains, the Christians in Nagasaki started engaging in underground religious practices to survive the persecution period. The Tokugawa shogunate took strong and strategic civil control measures by delegating regular resident registration assignments to Buddhist temples (danka seido: 檀家制度), conducting public persecutions, and making suspected individuals step on the images of Christ or Mary (fumie: 踏み絵). As the Catholics almost disappeared from the official record as a result of Tokugawa’s religious
governance, the Catholics in Nagasaki started camouflaging their religious practices by using Buddhist and Shintoist artifacts (Figure 6).

Such underground religious practices were organized and kept in several communities, some of which were beyond the boundaries of current Nagasaki prefecture. In the majorities of these underground Catholic communities, the descendants publicly converted back to the Catholicism following the formal arrival of the French Catholic missionaries in Nagasaki in 1864 and the end of the religious restrictions in 1873 by the Meiji administration. In contrast to communities with Catholic converts, some communities decided to retain their “underground” practices, and either have made their religious practices public, such as those in Ikitsuki, Hirado, and Naru (e.g. Nosco 1993; 2007; Turnbull 1998; Whelan 1996), or are still managing to keep their religious practices relatively hidden even from their neighbors. Currently, the residents, government officials, and the descendents of the regional feudal lords of former underground communities possess various kinds of religious commodities and intangible religious memories, such as statues of Mary disguised as the Buddhist Bodhisattva

27 Sometimes the Catholics failed in camouflaging their religious, and faced public persecutions during the Tokugawa period and the early Meiji period. Such incidents were labeled as kuzure (崩れ), which literally meant “break” and “collapse.”

28 While I was conducting my fieldwork around Nagasaki prefecture, the Catholic descendants of underground Christians commonly articulated a religious and theological continuity from the early Catholic missionaries of the 16th century through the sacrament of baptism. Throughout the underground period between the 17th and 19th centuries (according to the formal narrative, when Catholic priests or missionaries could not enter Japan), the leaders of underground Christian communities managed to give baptisms to their community members. However, this logic of baptism continuation does not apply to those who continued their underground practices even after the 19th century. Since the Catholic Church considers that there are no longer legitimate reasons to hide, the Church perceives their religious practices as either divergent or in continuance for the sake of hiding (e.g. Nosco 1993; 2007). Post-persecution period underground Christians are often identified as the Kakure Kirishitan (カクレキリシタン: hidden Christian) (e.g. Nosco 1993; 2007; Turnbull 1998; Whelan 1996). Even though Nagasaki’s Catholic diocese recognizes their historic relationships with the Kakure Kirishitans in their diocese, the diocese officially considers the Kakure as a non-Catholic or a non-Christian religious sect. For example, when the Kakure Kirishitans decided to officially become members of the local Catholic Church, the Catholic Church made it a requirement for them to be baptized under the Catholic institution.
Kannon (maria kannon: マリア観音), a Shintoist style scroll of a disguised Mary wearing a kimono and breast-feeding a baby, ceramic plates with hidden cross drawings, small paper cuttings of crosses, and documents of hand-written prayers. Such tangible materials and historical documents on the past persecutions are a few of the publicly accessible materials from the time of the underground period around Nagasaki, and several small museums around the prefecture, such as those in Hirado, Ikitsuki, Sotome, Nagasaki, Arikawa, and Fukue, make these historic materials available to the public.

However, as their ancestors tried to and as current underground members are trying to hide their religious activities as much as they can, the underground legacies are typically not observable in the landscapes around Nagasaki prefecture. What is observable in order to understand the geographic distribution of the historic underground Christianity period is the geographic distribution of the present Catholic churches – which the local Catholic diocese and the Nagasaki prefectural government advertise as the embodiment of the long-lasting Catholic faith around Nagasaki – and the spatial distribution of the Shinto shrines and the Buddhist temples which allowed the underground religious practices. As these edifices currently exist around Nagasaki prefecture, and are often actively used by community members, the narrative of the prefectural government’s Kirishitan project also is inclusive of the contemporary period.

By combining three different chronological periods of Catholic history within the boundary of contemporary Nagasaki – the early missionary period between the 16th and

---

29 Among Nagasaki’s underground Christian groups both of the past and the present – particularly of those around Nagasaki’s Goto archipelago, the prayer was primarily inherited orally. Documentation of their oral tradition – their prayer in this context – ritualistically marked the discontinuation of their underground practices. For example, when underground Christians officially and institutionally join the current Catholic denomination, some of the converts donate written prayers on a paper in a wooden container either to the local Catholic parish or to community museums.
the early 17th centuries, the underground period between the 17th and the 19th centuries, and the post-underground period after the 19th century, prefectural officials crafted a narrative to connect these historic sites – the dots, as Keiko described – around the prefecture. Prefectural officials were interested in preparing a story which could connect the places around Nagasaki prefecture and which could possibly appeal to prospective tourists as travel routes or even pilgrimages.30

The Background and the Issues with the Kirishitan Culture Project

One of the background reasons why the officials of the Nagasaki prefectural government needed to reevaluate the value of Kirishitan history around Nagasaki prefecture was partially because of the change in the national administrative system. Particularly, in their national administrative reform policy, the Koizumi Cabinet not only reduced the number of public projects, but also made it part of national policy to make regional administrations politically and financially more independent (see Chapter II). The Japanese national administration included a section referring to voluntary development of regional tourism promotion by regional administrations (the Tourism-based Country Promotion Action Plan: 観光立国行動計画).31 The Kirishitan culture project was Nagasaki officials’ appeal of their motivation or yaruki (see Chapter

30 As it was a project of one prefectural administration, even though there are former underground Kirishitan communities around neighboring prefectures such as Fukuoka, Saga, and Kumamoto, Nagasaki’s Kirishitan project does not include any historic Kirishitan communities or sites outside of Nagasaki prefecture. Since this Kirishitan project became a national World Heritage project, the prefectural government officials have negotiated with officials from the neighboring municipalities. As of January 2011, this project has not yet become either an inter-prefectural or a transboundary project.

31 Chapter II sec. 2 and sec. 3. This policy was revised and later implemented as the Tourism-based Country Promotion Basic Act (観光立国推進基本法) in 2006.
II) to the national administration by showing how they were strategically following the reform policy.

However, prior to this national reform project, Nagasaki was already known as a tourist destination and is still a popular tourist destination in Japan. The tourism agency is one of Nagasaki prefectural government’s core administrative divisions, and plays a key role in tourism development. Particularly with the history of the atomic bomb explosion,

Map 4: The map of “Nagasaki Jyunrei” tourism project. The prefectural officials connected the “dots” (Catholic churches and historic sites) in the prefecture with a “node” (tour route) (Nagasaki Tourism Association 2007: 9).

the presence of Chinatown, and the history of European influence, Nagasaki City is a popular tourist destination not only for domestic tourists, but also for international tourists. Tourism was not a brand-new concept for some of the residents in Nagasaki prefecture. Nagasaki had been one of the leading destinations in Japan’s tourism industry. Prefectural officials and those in the tourism industry perceived the problem as being
located in unbalanced tourism development in the prefecture. Although Nagasaki city had prospered as a leading tourist destination, few tourists explore areas beyond the city. One of my informants in the prefectural government described their plan as a way to divert the flow of the tourists to the rest of the prefecture (Map 4). While prefectural officials considered their Kirishitan culture project as a project to foster shared identity among the residents in the prefecture, they concurrently expected it to serve as an infrastructure-of-sorts to develop a prefecture-wide tourism industry, building narratives instead of constructing roads.

However, when approximately two percent of the total national population self-identify as Christians, how can Kirishitan culture – or the history of Catholicism in Nagasaki – function as the basis for tourism infrastructure? The Nagasaki prefectural government’s division of tourism set a specific target population for this tourism development project. Officials targeted busy urban residents and recently retired Japanese baby boomers who were busy and did not have time to heal their hearts (kokoro no iyashi: 心の癒し). Working with one of Japan’s largest tourism companies, the JTB Corporation, Nagasaki prefectural government marketed their Kirishitan tourism as a part of their Premium Nagasaki (プレミアム長崎) project (Figure 7). As the word premium indicates, the primary target of this tourism project was relatively wealthy retired seniors, who could stay in Nagasaki.

---

longer than other segments of the population. Prefectural officials hoped that this population would spend a few additional days outside of core tourist areas such as Nagasaki city and Sasebo.

Residents also have financial expectations of senior tourists. For example, one of my informants, Minoru, often expressed his concern on the tourism discrepancy – as he perceived – around Nagasaki prefecture. Growing up in one of the islands in Santo Archipelago and currently living in Tokyo, Minoru thought it would be necessary to design a tourist route to connect Nagasaki’s major tourism centers with other communities around the prefecture. Living in Tokyo and frequently making trips back to his hometown in Santo, Minoru concluded that it was easier for travelers from Tokyo to only visit Nagasaki city based on the duration and the cost of travel (conversation with author, January 31, 2008). While tourism centers such as Nagasaki City and Sasebo are located no more than two hours by bus from regional international airports such as Fukuoka and Nagasaki, it requires additional travel either by ground transportation or by maritime routes to reach a large part of the prefecture. Already having spent at least one and a half hours of air travel from Tokyo (and additional hours to get to the airport in Tokyo to check-in), Minoru stated that many tourists would not consider making trips to peripheral areas. Minoru’s argument corresponded with that of government officials’ expectations. As they viewed geographic factors as significant disadvantages for regional development, they hoped that the tourists who would travel to more distant locations in Japan would be willing to spend a longer period of time in Nagasaki than average tourists (Nagasaki Prefectural Government 2007: 6).
Tourism: Nagasaki’s Alarming News

Such a narrative of tourism development was more of a reaction to *alarming* news – in the sense of Andrew Arno’s term, *alarming report* (Arno 2009): particularly the long term recession since the early 1990s and the following administrative budget cut of the 2000s. As it seemed there was no clear sign of exit from the long-term recession and as the national government also reduced their public construction projects, prefectural officials conveyed an urgency to develop an alternative industry around the prefecture (Nagasaki Prefectural Government 2007: 4-7). Minoru shared the same sense of urgency to react to the crisis of depopulation and to the possibility of his hometown vanishing.

It is critical to note that there was a presence of national corporations behind this discourse of urgent crisis. In terms of the prefectural government’s tourism development projects, the officials were working with JTB to design and market their projects. The actors in the regional tourism industries perceived that it was beneficial for them to work with national corporations in order to access the wider market outside of the prefecture. While prefectural officials presented such benefits to local residents and business owners, the representatives of national tourism corporations often mingled such positive narratives with discourses of crisis.

For example, on February 20, 2008, a local tourism non-profit organization in Nagasaki’s Ojika island invited the managers of a tourism corporation from Kyoto to give a talk about their prospective tourism development project for the island municipality. One of the speakers was Alex Kerr, a self-proclaimed Japanologist, writer, and former manager of a Kyoto-based heritage tourism corporation, Chiiori (篪庵). Their lecture took place at the community ballroom next to the municipal hall which held
approximately 150 people out of approximately 3,000 residents, the total municipal population. The meeting organizer scheduled to start around 6:30 in the evening, which also is the busiest time of day for local hotel and restaurant owners.33

Having served as one of the roundtable members of Japan’s national cabinet,34 having published books from popular publishers in multiple countries (e.g. Kerr 1996; 2001), and presenting his cultural and linguistic expertise in Japanese, Kerr marketed himself as a man of international connections or kone (コネ: connections) ever since his first visit to Ojika in 2005. Kerr, as a gaijin (外人: foreigner) with such a high profile, began his lecture with a crisis trope: it was the crisis in which Japan was losing its traditional beauty due to the mismanagement of the bureaucrats and unrestricted construction, a crisis in which the remaining beauty in underdeveloped rural areas was endangered due to constant rural depopulation. According to Kerr, Japan had lost its traditional beauty. As there were more electric poles and high-rises in Kyoto, where his company was based, there were less old and traditional houses around Japanese cities. Kerr emphasized that the Japanese landscape was becoming boring (tsumaranai: つまらない) as a result. Concurrently, as depopulation progressed, the residents in rural communities depended financially more and more on public construction which destroyed the beauty of the Japanese rural communities (nihon no inaka: 日本の田舎).35

---

33 After Kerr’s lecture, I interviewed the managers of local hotels. They expressed how they felt that the organizers systematically excluded individuals from existing tourism-related industries. Local hotel owners thought that if they were serious about developing tourism, the organizers would arrange Kerr’s lecture around the time when local hotel and restaurant owners could attend instead of during their prime business hours (conversation with author, February 18, 2008).
34 The national roundtable on the tourism town development from foreigners’ perspectives (外国人から見た観光まちづくり懇談会)
35 Also, see Kerr (1996) for more of his opinions and perspectives on the result of Japanese urbanization and public construction.
Kerr praised his encounter with Ojika as a miracle (kiseki: 奇跡) in the sense that the islanders could keep the lost beauty of the Japanese inaka. Kerr strongly emphasized that tourism would be the last resort (saigo no sukui: 最後の救い) from the depopulation and the disappearance of the beautiful Japanese inaka.

In Kerr’s logic, tourism was portrayed as a strategic response to the crisis of the island. Kerr, as an owner of a Kyoto-based corporation, spent the lecture presenting a business project along with his partner to those in the ballroom. Yet, what the organizer did prior to the event was quite deceiving. In the brochure which they distributed around the island municipality, the organizer advertised the event as an opportunity for Kerr, presented as a specialist of East Asian cultures (toyobunka kenkyu ka: 東洋文化研究家), to provide important advice on community building (machizukuri no jyuyo na jyogen: まちづくりの重要な助言) (Figure 8). The contents of the brochure were not entirely incorrect in the sense that Kerr did give advice in the format of a lecture to the crowd. However, his advice was connected to his own corporate benefit. Before the crowd of 150 people, Kerr did not or could not present how to contextualize or
articulate his idea of tourism development to the existing socio-economic context in Ojika. He either did not or could not mention the possibility of how tourism could establish a new dialogic sphere between the existing social networks of the islanders and the expectations of the visitors, which could even change what Kerr was claiming as traditional and beautiful.³⁶ An immediate response to the crisis would be needed, and it was Kerr’s company which could help the islanders be in a circle of kachigumi (勝ち組: winners) in a time of national depression. As a holistic industry (sougou sangyo: 総合産業), which would bridge multiple economic sectors from the primary (e.g. agriculture, and fisheries), the secondary (e.g. construction and maintenance), the tertiary (e.g. hotels and other service industries), even to the quaternary (e.g. computer networking and programming), Kerr and his partner presented themselves as a symbolic response to alarming news, and as the strategic path to form a capitalist entry into their prospective market.

Kirishitan Culture as Identity Symbol?

As prefectural authorities and corporations conveyed a sense of urgency to respond to the crisis of economic downturn and to the national administrative reform, prefectural officials’ response was to develop a prefecture-wide narrative which could market Nagasaki to the rest of Japan and to the world. What officials came up with was the narrative of Kirishitan culture in Nagasaki prefecture. They expected that tourists would make use of their Kirishitan narrative as a route, and concurrently expected the

---

³⁶ This was the third personal visit to Ojika for Kerr and the first visit for his business partner from Kyoto. In fact, some of the local officials and the researchers questioned the degree of Kerr and his business partner’s familiarity with the social contexts of local business and interpersonal dynamics, and directly confronted them with this during the dinner following the lecture.
narrative to function as a shared memory of the residents in the prefecture (Figure 9).

However, the narrative still faced the reality that Nagasaki’s Catholic population was only five percent of the entire prefectural population (and there were far fewer underground Kirishtians in the prefecture), so how could Kirishitan culture be the symbol of the residents in the prefecture? While officials may have invested substantial work hours and budget to design this Kirishitan project, local residents, including local Catholics, did not seem to share the same sense of identity attachment – in fact, some of the residents rather avoided dealing with topics of Kirishitan history in their neighborhood. Consequently, some municipal officials expressed uneasiness in being sandwiched between prefectural officials’ motivations in the project and the reaction from local residents to.
Instead of seeing Kirishitan-related heritage as a symbol of Nagasaki prefecture, throughout my stay in Nagasaki’s Narae island, my informants frequently expressed being unfamiliar with the churches or the Kirishitan properties which the prefectural officials were promoting. I had such an encounter right after I arrived in Narae that Kirishitan culture was an unfamiliar part of many locals’ daily activities. This was on my third day in Narae. At a local restaurant, I had a chance to interact with the regular customers of a restaurant during the lunch hour. The regular customers, who were owners of local retail stores, primarily in their fifties, noticed that I was a new face, and started chatting with me. They wanted to know why I was on the island. After a brief explanation of my research project, they immediately shared with me an interesting opinion. One of the customers, Makoto, stated, “I know about these local churches. And, I know that they are getting national attention. However, I’ve never visited any of them. I guess many islanders give the same response to you. Don’t you think so?”

His friend nodded agreeing with Makoto’s comment. Those two customers were not members of any local Catholic church, and exemplified an important aspect of local religious dynamics. Instead of encompassing a shared memory, the spatial distributions of Catholic communities and Kirishitan-related historic sites are district-specific around Nagasaki prefecture. Around the prefecture, the spatial arrangements of communities, cemeteries, Buddhist temples, Shinto shrines, and Catholic churches implied a division of Catholic, Shinto and Buddhist spheres. Quite often, hills, camellia forests, or cemeteries were distinctive dividing markers of communities. Even though local residents, including Makoto and Akira, visit other districts outside of their neighborhood, it was rare for them...
to visit local religious institutions, such as temples and churches, other than on some special occasions such as weddings or funerals.

In Narae, even the Catholic residents questioned prefectural officials’ narratives to reevaluate Kirishitan culture as a shared symbol of the prefecture. Tomoko, who grew up in a Catholic family in a community with a heritage church, stated that she did not know much about the historical background of most of the Catholic or Kirishitan communities other than her home community. Tomoko’s comment corresponded with how many other Catholics in the community perceived their community’s Kirishitan history. While I was conducting my fieldwork in Narae, Tomoko’s parish was preparing for the centennial anniversary event of their parish. As a part of their centennial project, leaders of the parish decided to publish a book on the history of the community including the underground period prior to 19th century Meiji restoration. Parish members held frequent meetings starting from September 2007, in which they frequently expressed how they were unfamiliar even with the history of their parish. As they reviewed the donated materials from their underground period, such as statues of the disguised Mary and the scrolls of the missionaries around the end of the persecution

Figure 10: The priest of a local Catholic parish (center) and two kyodoshikas examine a donated liturgical calendar of local Kakure Kirishitan (at Dozaki Kirishitan Museum, October 30, 2007).

38  ‘I know about my parish, but if someone asked me about other parish in Nagasaki…, I don’t know (自分の教会のことは知ってるけど、他のところを聞かれても…、知らないよね). [Conversation with author, April 19, 2008]
period in the mid-19th century, the parish members frequently had to ask local historians – who were typically retired school teachers (*kyoudoshika*: 郷土史家) – to analyze and evaluate the historic meanings and the possible use of these stored materials (Figure 10).

Even though the parish members recognized that these stored materials held some historic importance, they were clearly not familiar with any specific significance. Unlike the local Catholics in Narae and in the rest of Nagasaki prefecture who identify their connections with other Catholics through their beliefs and religious practices, their emotional ties to the Kirishitan culture usually do not go across their current geographical and chronological spheres. For Catholic residents, the Kirishitan culture was situated in their ongoing religious practices, but it could not correspond with the vague bracketing identity symbol which the prefectural officials were proposing.

*Unshared Memory, Unshared Identity*

Ultimately, Nagasaki prefectural government’s Kirishitan project got the attention of the national officials, and the fifteen Catholic churches in Nagasaki became Japan’s national tentative World Heritage properties in January 2007. While officials were processing the Kirishitan narrative for review from a higher administrative layer, local residents in Nagasaki were still unsure – or even unaware – about the contents of prefectural government’s *Kirishitan* narrative. Prefectural officials’ reconstruction of their Kirishitan narrative was based on their strategic reaction to the national administrative reform and on their understanding of the expectation of the prospective retired tourists. While the prefectural officials invested their efforts in forming a limited

---

39 In his translated work, Keith Brown presented how *kyoudoshikas* engage in the collection of local accounts through the editing of local chronicle *kyodoshi* – *sonshi* (村史) in his translation of *Shinjo* (Brown 1979).
interpretive sphere on Kirishitan culture within the public administration, they consequently failed to design effective strategies to articulate their Kirishitan narrative with specific collective memories of each community around the prefecture to make it as a shared narrative of the residents in the Nagasaki prefecture.

When the Japanese national government implied that Nagasaki’s churches were selected after a fair degree of community participation (Agency for Cultural Affairs 2007), local officials had already created a crucial interpretive discontinuity between the public and the government on Kirishitan history in the prefecture. The officially crafted “shared memory” was detached from existing local narratives, and the residents in Nagasaki prefecture started noticing such detachment when the national government announced their selection of the Catholic churches. Ironically, what the local residents noticed in the national announcement was the absence of their opinions in the administrative process of the World Heritage or regional development policy. Instead of filling the gap between the official narrative and the local interpretations of history, the prefectural officials started to push their project to be more administratively successful. The prefectural officials started pressuring municipal officials to quickly design the zoning policies which they thought would meet with the preservation standard of the national government and UNESCO’s World Heritage committee. Overloaded with legal terminology, such strategies not only turned out to slow down but also almost halted the prefectural government’s World Heritage nomination project. In the next chapter, I examine how and why the legal complexity of the World Heritage nomination process almost stalled the project to a halt.
Chapter IV: Living in the Legal Exuberances and Deficiencies: Legal and Sociolinguistic Communication

In this chapter, I ethnographically examine how Japanese officials struggle to translate sections of UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention and implement them as a part of a local heritage preservation policy while they concurrently have to explain the purpose and the goal of the World Heritage nomination project to their constituents. The practice of translating an international policy is in fact a process of a legal vernacularization (e.g. Merry 2006). By finding corresponding domestic statutes or customary practices, intermediary actors or legal translators often engage in making an international policy accessible to those in the domestic public sphere. In other words, the legal vernacularization is usually the process to make it easier for a wider audience to understand an international policy. However, the vernacularization process of an international policy is not an intuitive process, but a rather complicated one. When there are no directly corresponding domestic statutes to the international policy – this is typically the common issue with legal vernacularization, the intermediary actors often use varieties of domestic statutes to create a legal narrative which would correspond with the international policy. Even though those domestic statutes do not seem to be directly connected to the international policy, they contain a Peircean sense of pragmatic indices within the statutes (Peirce 1965). Therefore, the collection of these indices could function as the semiotic interface between the local sphere and the global sphere. Yet, the possible corresponding domestic statutes still seem quite different from the international policy, and not only do those in the domestic public sphere but also the intermediary actors become puzzled about the entire legal vernacularization process.
With the analysis of how the intermediary actors – the public officials in Nagasaki in this study – struggle or get lost in the translation process of UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention, I present the vernacularization of an international policy as a highly complicated legal and cultural translation in which the use of the linguistic and cultural exuberances and the deficiencies highly influence the transformation process of the Convention into a locally particular heritage preservation policy. Both for the intermediary actors and those in the domestic public sphere, it is to their advantage to be familiar with the pragmatic indices both in the Convention and in the domestic statutes. The following ethnographic story depicts how Nagasaki’s officials struggle at the juxtaposition between UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention and the local social context, while they were ironically trying to promote products from Nagasaki in an international setting, an upscale district in Beijing, China. On one hand, the promotion of Nagasaki products in China is viewed as a way to remain solvent; on the other hand, globalization brings a number of threats to the local living sphere via tourism and increasing challenges for local industry. Those who are in advantageous positions are not only familiar with multiple legal indices but also able to use them as tools (Moore 1978) at the negotiation table.

In Beijing’s Upscale District

On October 18, 2008, I was in the Xin Guang Tiandi (新光天地) shopping center in the middle of Beijing’s upper class district. Xin Guang Tiandi is one of the most expensive shopping centers in China filled with high-end international stores such as Yves Saint Laurent, Gucci, Prada, Chanel, and even Muji (無印良品). It was not only in the middle of Beijing’s fancy high-rises and condominiums, but the cars parked around
the shopping center were also extremely high-end such as Lexus, Mercedes, BMWs, and black Buicks. It was approximately three weeks since I had moved to Beijing after finishing my fieldwork in Japan, and I had spent most of my time around Peking University, where I was staying as a visiting scholar. Being in Xin Guang Tiandi, I was stunned by the incredible income gaps in China, or in Beijing alone. While many noodle shops near Peking University served meals for approximately US $1 (8 RMB), the mall’s visitors drove extremely expensive cars which the majority of residents in developed countries probably could not afford. For example, the cheapest dish in this district cost approximately US $5 (40 RMB). While typical Chinese retailers were unwilling to accept 100 renminbi (RMB) bills (with the shiny, red-hued image of Mao Zedong) from their customers, the red Mao bills looked as the most basic bills of the economic exchange in Xin Guang Tiandi. In Xin Guang Tiandi, neither Mao nor the red seemed to carry the previous symbolic meaning of communist ideology. Rather, they were reinterpreted as symbols of economic development, symbols of extreme capitalism, or the symbol of – what the Chinese officials and scholars call – the socialist market economy with Chinese characteristics (中国特色的社会主义市场经济).
However, I was not in the mall to be stunned by the extremes of class differences in China. I was there to observe the first day of the Nagasaki Festival (JP: 日本長崎フェア, CN: 北京日本长崎展) (Figure 11). It was the first ever marketing event in Beijing by one of Japan’s regional governments. The intention of Nagasaki prefectural officials was clear. The government was going to help the companies in the prefecture to pave the way to enter Beijing’s upscale market. With the governor of Nagasaki, the mayors of Nagasaki’s municipalities were also at Xin Guang Tiandi with products from their municipalities such as sushi, noodles, green tea, shochu, and pottery. To start this week-long marketing campaign, the organizer arranged a tuna-slicing demonstration (JP: maguro kaitai sho: マグロ解体ショー, CN: 金枪鱼解剖表演) (Figure 12). While the floor of the tuna-cutting performance was packed with spectators, I noticed a person in a business suits looking at me. After a few seconds of a staring contest, we both placed each other and explained what we were up to so far away from Nagasaki. He was Masaru, the mayor of Higashi-Santo from the Nagasaki prefecture.

On the floor where the sushi chefs were slicing a five-foot long tuna from Nagasaki, Masaru started talking to me, sighing. Remembering that I was in Nagasaki until three weeks ago conducting my fieldwork on the World Heritage nomination and related heritage preservation projects, Masaru started giving me updates with the
progress of his municipality’s World Heritage nomination project. Masaru stated, “Yamada-san. I really don’t know what to do. The opinion of some of the professors in our municipal committee and that of the national investigators are completely different [on the World Heritage nomination]. It is really difficult…This World Heritage thing is difficult” (conversation with author, October 18, 2008). In Beijing’s upscale shopping center where Masaru and other representatives from Nagasaki came to promote their merchandise, he expressed his concern on the prospect of the World Heritage nomination project, which was another one of Nagasaki’s economic development projects.

Masaru’s frustration was more than just his personal opinion of Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project. It depicted the fundamental problem of policy translation and implementation: how would the words in an international policy have a real grip in our living sphere? Ever since I came to know Masaru and the public officials of his municipality in December 2007, they were constantly struggling with this question: how to interpret UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention; how to articulate the Convention with Japan’s domestic legal system; and how to effectively convince local residents. Even being so far away from his office in Higashi-Santo, Masaru was worrying about the project back in his municipality. While World Heritage is often portrayed as the symbol of economic opportunity and a strong icon of tourism development, public officials view themselves as paving the way for the public to the point of economic opportunity. Particularly in Nagasaki, officials including Masaru were concerned about how to secure a solid case to officially have their local heritage a World Heritage property.

What does it mean to make a place a World Heritage site? What does it mean to make a space World Heritage? Or more specifically, how do government officials and

40 Or probably, my presence in Xin Guang Tiandi reminded Masaru of the World Heritage project.
local residents struggle to select the sentences from the Japanese legal system to correspond with UNESCO’s expectations, and how do they attempt to contextualize them in the everyday practices of the local residents in Nagasaki? While building a sense of nationalism among a diverse populace or developing the tourism sector are possible outcomes of a successful World Heritage registration, it all remains in the realm of the possible unless local actors take concrete steps to attain World Heritage status. In other words, prior to the expectation of the increase of tourists or the use of prospective World Heritage properties as national/regional icons, local actors have to grapple with a legal nomination process that meets with UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee’s expectation; they have to prove that the properties are protected under an appropriate heritage preservation policy. The appropriate preservation policy, according to the official interpretation of the Japanese national government of UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention, is the one which corresponds with the general framework written in the sections of UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention: particularly between Article 4 and Article 7 of the Convention, which consists of 522 words in the English version (563 words in the French version). While the representation of a culture and the representations of universal cultures become highly politicized subjects in UNESCO’s World Heritage program (see Eriksen 2001; 2006; Scholze 2008; Titchen 1996; Turtinen 2000) which certainly require the attention of local actors, the legal aspects of World Heritage preservation must be tended to in order for anything to happen. The major legal question in the World Heritage nomination process is how to contextualize the sections in the World Heritage Convention with a domestic legal system, and how to implement them as a part of a regionally particular heritage preservation policy. This is the process
of how local actors transform those 522 English words of the Convention into a regionally particular preservation policy by mingling them with the words and the phrases of a domestic legal system (Silverstein 2003). Such a regionally particular preservation policy is the result of the shuffling and reshuffling of the words and the phrases of the Convention with the domestic legal system; the resulting hybrid document serves as an interface: a “semiotic meeting point” (Mertz 2007: 346) between the local and the global sphere (e.g. Bowen 2003; Hirsch 2006; Merry 2006; Riles 1998).

**The World Heritage Guessing Game**

While I was conducting my fieldwork in Nagasaki, almost all of the municipal officials had experienced the same – or even worse – puzzling moments when they were crafting what they hoped would be an appropriate heritage preservation policy for the World Heritage nomination project. Typical questions among officials and the local residents around Nagasaki prefecture were simple; why were some of the officials talking about such unrelated laws as the Landscape Act, the City Planning Act, or even farming-related acts when they were dealing with the World Heritage nomination? The answer is simple; the prospective World Heritage areas have to be protected under appropriate legal measures. However, it was not so simple to explain how to protect the areas and which laws to use to meet appropriate legal measures. Pragmatically finding out the indexical connection between the language of an international policy such as UNESCO’s World Heritage program and that of the Japanese legal system was far from intuitive task. Rather the difficulty of making such indexical connections was a primary
task, but probably the most difficult assignment for municipal officials in Nagasaki prefecture.

My first encounter with such legal guessing games – or the indexical aspect of the World Heritage nomination project – was right after I arrived in Nagasaki prefecture in September 2007. On September 10, during my first interview with him after the national nomination earlier this year, Hiroshi, who was a municipal preservation specialist of Narae City, explained to me his understanding of the legal aspect of Nagasaki’s upcoming World Heritage nomination project. It was the first interview with Hiroshi since March 2005, and it was also the first interview after the Japanese national government officially selected the Catholic churches in Nagasaki prefecture as their national tentative World Heritage properties in January 2007. I initially planned the meeting as a sign of greeting and as a way to explain what I was going to do next year in Narae and the Nagasaki prefecture. At the same time, I was expecting to have brief information on the progress with their nomination project and how the government officials were processing the legal aspect of the project. During the course of the interview, Hiroshi stated:

In upcoming October, our municipality and others [municipalities] in this World Heritage project will officially sign an administrative agreement (*kyotei*: 協定) with the [Nagasaki] prefectural government on this nomination project. … When the agreement comes into effect, we will start working on drafting the *core* [preservation] *zones* and their *buffer zones* of the World Heritage property. Particularly, the issue is how to draft the buffer zones. Most of the Catholic communities in Narae are *han-nou han-gyo* (半農半漁: half-agricultural and half-fishing [economy]). Due to depopulation, the terrace has been reforested. The question is how to preserve the landscape.

[conversation with author, September 10, 2007 (emphasis added by the author)]
Hiroshi’s explanation contained a significant amount of information on how he interpreted and understood the legal aspect of the World Heritage nomination project. Instead of using any terms from the domestic statutes or a preservation policy, he used the terms from UNESCO’s documents – a core zone and a buffer zone – to explain the direction of their World Heritage nomination project. Narae city had nominated three Catholic churches which Hiroshi considered as core zones at the time of the initial interview with me. Also according to Hiroshi, the buffer zones would be the surrounding landscapes which could visually represent the cultural and geographic characteristics of those Catholic communities in Narae and Nagasaki. During the interview, Hiroshi was discursively appropriating those terms from UNESCO’s documents but not from Japan’s domestic statutes. Including this interview, while I was conducting my fieldwork in Nagasaki prefecture, I frequently encountered situations in which the local officials and the local proponents of the World Heritage project explained their idea of the World Heritage preservation by using the terms directly from the World Heritage Convention or UNESCO’s other documents. Even though the local officials discursively used those terms from an international convention, they did not (or could not) clearly explain how they would enforce any preservation measures. On one hand, how would the officials from the Japanese national government and the municipal governments in Nagasaki explain to UNESCO’s World Heritage committee that the heritage properties in those prospective core zones and buffer zones were properly protected? On the other hand, if the officials would try to implement international zoning terminology, what kinds of regulations would be imposed on local residents in Narae and other parts of Nagasaki

41 The general definition of the core and buffer zones are found between paragraphs 96 and 119 of the chapter II.F, the “Protection and Management,” of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2008).
prefecture? Hiroshi’s explanation contained an indexical ambiguity or discontinuity between the UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention and the possible legal enforcement measure at the local level.

**Indexical Connection, Legal Translation**

Even though there were some (or significant) indexical discontinuities in Hiroshi’s explanation, since there were official World Heritage properties in Japan, there was an established legal linkage between the World Heritage Convention and the legal enforcement measure at the local level. Rather than with Hiroshi or other local officials in Nagasaki, I arranged to have an interview with those who already had dealt with the preceding World Heritage nomination project in Japan. It was approximately a week after I met Hiroshi that I interviewed Nobu at a university in a Tokyo suburb. It required a two-hour plane ride and a four-hour ferry ride from Narae for me to meet with Nobu. Nobu – who later became one of the committee members for the Nagasaki prefectural government – was a member of Japan’s national World Heritage committee. Prior to his then-current faculty position at the university, Nobu served as a heritage specialist and investigator for the Japanese national government; he had also been highly involved in certifying Catholic churches in Nagasaki as national heritage properties.

While I was asking him several questions which I had prepared prior to the interview, Nobu dropped a comment on the national government’s official interpretation of the World Heritage nomination. Nobu stated:

> Under the Japanese national policy, prospective World Heritage properties have to be secured (*tampo*: 担保) under a domestic law. Those prospective

---

42 My initial plan for this interview was to ask him why he and other national investigators choose Catholic Churches in Nagasaki as their tentative heritage properties.
heritage properties have to be registered under the national Act on Protection of Cultural Properties (bunkazai hogo ho: 文化財保護法) before the national government can officially nominate them to UNESCO. However, UNESCO’s preservation policy and the Japanese national act are different legal systems. It is to align those two different preservation policies when we propose new World Heritage properties to UNESCO’s committee. This is difficult. [conversation with author, September 19, 2007]

Nobu’s statement is partially supported by the list and the maps of Japan’s current World Heritage properties. The monumental architecture of those World Heritage properties in Japan are registered national cultural heritage properties. Most World Heritage properties are either monuments or architecture. In other words, they are core monuments rather than core zones: they are points rather than spaces. If Nagasaki’s nomination project followed this monumental approach, Hiroshi’s interpretation would have been in line with Japan’s proceeding World Heritage properties. Hiroshi understood the Catholic churches – monuments – as the core heritage properties. However, how would the officials legally protect prospective core zones and buffer zones? More specifically, when there are differences between a monument and a zone, how would the officials connect the indices in UNESCO’s World Heritage program and those in the national Act on Protection of Cultural Properties? At the first interview, Hiroshi did not imply much about the possible indexical connections between the two preservation policies or between the local and the global. Nobu stated that it was difficult but left it unclear how to articulate two policies (however, as Nobu stated during the course of the prefectural committee meetings, he had an idea how to connect those legal systems. It seems that he had some problems how to express his idea to others. For Hiroshi and other municipal officials, the following year became a time for them to learn the legal indices and concurrently prepare their nomination project. Beginning in October 2007, when
participating municipalities began inviting national investigators to serve as observers and advisors, municipal officials, including Hiroshi, gradually started to determine how national officials understood the World Heritage indices.

*World Heritage Preservation = Zoning Regulation*

In early October of 2007, approximately a month after my initial interview with Hiroshi, he asked me to make a map for him. At first, I wondered about why he did not ask his colleagues to help him. I was initially reluctant. However, since Hiroshi was one of my primary informants in Narae, I thought I would be impossible to turn down his request (as for my ethical dilemma on this matter, please see Chapter VII). According to Hiroshi, he was not the one who was making this request. The national investigator, who had just visited Narae, requested the map in order to facilitate strategies and processes to nominate some of the landscape in Narae as national cultural heritage properties (conversation with author, October 26, 2007). Hiroshi stated that the national investigator asked him to make a map in which the investigator could see the spatial distribution of the then-existing land use regulations in Narae. Contrary to how Hiroshi previously cited the terms directly from the UNESCO’s Convention, he listed the names of specific land use regulations during this conversation such as: agricultural land (農用地: *nou you chi*) and agricultural promotion regions (農業振興地域: *nogyou shinko chiiki*), forest reservations (保安林: *hoan rin*), and national parks (国立公園地域: *kokuritsu koen chiiki*). Those regulations were purpose-based zoning regulations, and do not directly relate to any aspects of cultural heritage. Rather they were either zoning measures for commercial activities or natural environment preservation measures. However, unlike
such vague terms as a core zone or a buffer zone, each of those land use regulations held enforcement measures.

The enforcement measures within those land use regulations were clues to discover what the national officials viewed as the articulating indices between local ordinances, Japan’s national statutes, and UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention. For example, agricultural land is a legally designated area only for farming activities. If the owner or the tenant of the land wishes to remove this legal designation from their property (e.g. to build a house or some other facilities), they have to submit a request for approval from the public administration and state their intent. If the owners do not file, but simply use the areas for non-farming activities (e.g. building an apartment building), they can face both an administrative penalty and a criminal charge. National officials interpret such enforcement measures in zoning regulations as effective legal security for the World Heritage preservation project, and perceive them as legitimate indices.

At the local level, zoning regulations – or the possibility of punishment – were not unfamiliar to the local residents of Narae City and of Nagasaki prefecture. Referencing those regulations made residents feel wary. For example, the local branch of the Japan Fisheries Cooperatives in Narae previously faced an administrative penalty due to their unfamiliarity with the National Park Act (kokuritsu koen ho: 国立公園法). The fishermen of the Cooperatives repaired their fish farm cage by cutting the trees near their fish farm. The Cooperatives’ secretary stated that they were extremely surprised but did not know that the trees were in the Saikai National Park (Saikai Kokuritsu Koen: 西海国立公園) until the public officials contacted the Cooperatives to notify the secretary that the government was officially going to penalize the Cooperatives for violation of the
National Park Act (interview with the author, June 17, 2008). Even though the secretary of the local fisheries’ cooperatives stated that they did not know the precise boundary of the zoning regulations, they understood that zoning was an instrument of legal discipline. In various social occasions, such as designing a new building or a house, changing land use patterns, or cutting a tree, local residents usually consider the probable penalties that might accompany their actions. Zoning regulations are words which can transform into an invisible spatial layer which grips the surface of our living environment, and secures segments of social lives in a designated landscape.

*Studying the Indices*

The national officials intuitively made such indexical connections through legal enforcement measures both in the World Heritage Convention and in Japan’s domestic legal system. Even though national officials understood the indexical and conceptual connections between land use regulations and the World Heritage Convention, it did not mean the others would also view the relationships between the international and local statutes in the same way. While I was conducting my research in Nagasaki, typical public understanding of a heritage preservation measure was that the measure would freeze selected aspects of human activities – a *tradition* or a *culture* in the sense of general public discourse – in a designated living space, which would ultimately be called a heritage property. Contrary to such freezing aspect of heritage preservation, land use regulations were not only understood as to regulate human activity but also to concurrently encourage individuals to engage in designated segments of human activities.
in an assigned spatial area. Zoning regulations limit human activities, but zoning is not synonymous with *preservation*.

The local municipal officials around Nagasaki prefecture were the first group of individuals who were exposed to national officials’ legal narratives on heritage preservation. Therefore, instead of immediately preparing for the official nomination (which the former governor of Nagasaki prefecture wanted to complete by 2011), the municipal officials in Nagasaki prefecture, including those in Narae, had to start learning the legal and indexical rationale of national officials. The municipal officials were stuck in-between the indexical rationale of the national officials, which they were not familiar with, and the expectations of local constituents, who wanted simple explanations about the possible impacts that nomination may make on their daily routines.

Since the beginning of my fieldwork, I observed how municipal officials in Nagasaki were mastering the logical and indexical connections of the national officials on zoning regulations and the World Heritage Convention. The most frustrating aspect for these officials was that they had to learn and digest the indexical logic of the national officials while the governor’s office was concurrently pressuring them to draft and implement the preservation policy as soon as possible. Moreover, when the municipal officials started learning the national officials’ indexical logic, they were still unsure of where and how they were going to implement land use regulations or a heritage preservation policy. While the municipal officials were still at the stage of learning, they concurrently had to face pressure from the prefectural government and pressure from
local residents, who wanted to know the details of the possible impacts of the upcoming regulation policy (kisei: 規制).

On December 20, 2007, I was at Narae city hall where officials from Narae and neighboring municipalities were having a one-day legal workshop on landscape preservation for the World Heritage nomination. Having the officials from the landscape town management division (keikan machizukuri: 景観まちづくり) of the Nagasaki prefectural government and a junior specialist from the national Agency for Cultural Affairs, the workshop was designed to provide an opportunity for municipal officials from three of Nagasaki’s island municipalities not only to learn the national Landscape Act (keikan hou: 景観法) and national cultural landscape preservation policy (jyuyo bunkateki keikan seido: 重要文化的景観制度), but also to simulate implementation of landscape-related laws as well as to explain the project to local residents (author’s observation, December 20, 2007).

Prior to the start of the World Heritage nomination project, almost none of the municipalities in the World Heritage nomination project had ever officially considered implementing any ordinances related to the national Landscape Act. The speakers had prepared the contents of the workshop for the municipal officials so they could learn the basics of the Landscape Act and understand cultural landscape preservation policy, including the backgrounds of the relevant laws and the standard timelines and criteria for

---

43 Instead of the preservation (hozon: 保存) aspect of the World Heritage nomination project, local residents were more concerned with the regulatory (kisei: 規制) aspect to freeze the condition of their living environment. (author’s observation, August 3, 2008)

44 The sole exception is the City of Nagasaki, which implemented a landscape ordinance (keikan jyorei: 景観条例) in 1988. Also, the former mayor’s committee of Sasebo City, which was one of the municipalities in the World Heritage nomination project, had previously suggested that the city consider implementing a landscape ordinance. However, their suggestion had not become a formal policy when the former mayor finished his term in 2007 (interview with the author, April 20, 2008).
implementation by outlining examples from other municipalities around Japan. In a total of four hours, the speakers explained when and how the national Landscape Act came into effect, what the prerequisites were before drafting a landscape ordinance, what would constitute the required or recommended number of meetings with local residents, and what the possible penalties for violations of the law would be.

Confused with the Indices

This workshop was one of the earliest sessions for the municipal officials to learn about the nature and the characteristics of the national landscape policies, and the municipal officials had not yet gotten a clear vision on how and where they would implement landscape- and other zoning-related ordinances. For example, when I visited an official from Higashi-Santo town, Satoshi, one week after the workshop, he was more confused than familiarized by the contents of the workshop. I arranged a meeting with Satoshi after the workshop at Narae City Hall. The interaction between me and Satoshi started when I gave GIS-processed maps of the land use regulations of Narae City to Hiroshi. During the workshop break, Hiroshi and I were reviewing the maps on a laptop computer which was connected to the screen of the workshop venue. Satoshi saw the maps which were projected on the screen, and asked me to help make zoning maps of their municipality.

Prior to my visit to the municipal hall of Higashi-Santo, I requested Satoshi to supply me with zoning maps, such as the maps of the national parks, forest reservations, urban planning zones, and agricultural lands. All of these zoning designations were those which I previously had to digitally process for Hiroshi and the national investigator.
When I arrived at Higashi-Santo municipal hall, Satoshi stated that he had to ask the officials from several divisions in the municipal hall to acquire the zoning maps which I had requested. While he was spreading the maps on the meeting table, Satoshi told me the telling comments made by one of his colleagues from the municipal hall:

I think that I can understand why we need the map of the national parks. However, my colleague was wondering how the map of the agricultural lands would relate to the World Heritage nomination. [conversation with author, December 27, 2007]

It dismisses the critical aspect of Satoshi’s colleague’s question if we only assumed he just could not understand the indexical logic of the national officials. Satoshi’s colleague made the comment when Satoshi asked him for the latest updated version of the map of agricultural lands. Satoshi pointed out that the town had never modified the agricultural zones since the 1960s (or Showa 40s) when the population of the town was twice as large as that of the present (Table 4). As of the winter of 2007, when I visited Satoshi’s office, a large number of agricultural lands in Higashi-Santo were either abandoned (kosaku
hoki: 耕作放棄) or had already been reforested, and no longer functioned as agricultural lands. Satoshi’s colleagues questioned the effectiveness of using the Agricultural Land Act for heritage preservation. Under the Act, agricultural lands are strictly designated for farming activities. However, there is nothing to prevent them from abandoning their plots. While the actual landscape had changed due to the progression of reforestation in the agricultural lands, the legal map had stayed constant over the last fifty years.

The more the municipal officials studied frameworks and the general outlines of landscape preservation policies and the national officials’ indexical logics, the more locally and legally specific issues they faced. The legal foundation for the indexical connection between the local and global would not even be set until the local officials and the residents would collaboratively find out how to contextualize the contents of their workshops with the particular contexts of the everyday activities of local residents. The irony was that while the municipal officials were still at the stage of learning the indexical logic between the World Heritage Convention and Japan’s land use regulation system, the Nagasaki prefectural government was widely proclaiming that they would officially nominate the Catholic churches to UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee in three years. Not being updated by their municipal administrations, the residents of Nagasaki assumed that municipal officials had a clear and detailed plan for the official nomination.

Legal Communication: On the Inside, On the Outside

What the municipal officials faced from the time of the national announcement of the selection of Nagasaki’s Catholic churches in Japan’s national World Heritage
tentative list were constant indexical shifts in the process of translating UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention. The more the municipal officials learned about the intermediary processes and national officials’ indexical logic and the more they tried to articulate the international convention to local social contexts, the more they had to repeatedly simulate how they would use sections from multiple zoning regulations to form an effective indexical connection between the local and global. In this process, the national and municipal officials shuffled (Riles 1998) the words in the Article 4 through 7 of the World Heritage Convention and attempted to contextualize them to multiple zoning regulations and to the everyday activities of local residents (Silverstein and Urban 1996). Throughout this process, the 522 English words of the World Heritage Convention expanded into a collection of multiple Japanese domestic laws including the national heritage preservation policy and both national and municipal zoning regulations. Each of those statutes is connected to enforcement measures, even though some of these zoning regulations are not directly related to the heritage preservation.

However, for those unfamiliar with national officials’ indexical logic – both local officials and residents involved in Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, it was not a matter of intuition to uncover national officials’ indexical logic that operated between the World Heritage Convention and the local ordinances. As the municipal officials learned more about national officials’ indexical logic, they tried to clarify the “vagueness” (Brenneis 2006) of the neatly crafted “clean and tight text” (Riles 1998: 389) of the World Heritage Convention. The creation of legal exuberances with the World Heritage Convention in Nagasaki was a process of building indexical connections between the global and the local by repeatedly reshuffling and contextualizing the words.
and phrases of multiple statutes and segments of everyday practices of the local residents around Nagasaki prefecture. In this process, both municipal officials and local residents even questioned the specificity of the core index, enforcement measure. For example, municipal officials endlessly argued whether the proper enforcement measure would be regulation (kisei: 規制) or guidance (yudo: 誘導).45

While public officials were struggling, the municipal officials in learning national officials’ indexical logic, and national officials in learning local social practices, the residents were excluded from the process of legal exuberance formation. Instead of being informed about the nomination progress made by the municipal government, they were more exposed to the prefectural governor’s media campaign on the expedited World Heritage nomination. Local residents assumed that the municipal officials had already made detailed zoning and nomination plans and were avoiding disclosing information to the local residents. For example, approximately a half year had passed in July 2008 since the workshop of the World Heritage project in December 2007, Hiroshi and two other municipal officials of Narae visited a neighborhood board meeting to explain their plans on the upcoming World Heritage related cultural landscape survey. Community leaders asked the officials questions, which the officials later described to me as surprising. The municipal officials had prepared explanations which they thought would serve to secure appropriate consent from the community board members to conduct landscape surveys. After the officials spent approximately ten minutes explaining the contents of their landscape survey, one of the community board members exhibited some frustration and started asking questions.

45 By March 2011, all of the municipalities in Nagasaki’s World Heritage project implemented their own landscape ordinances. Instead of giving those ordinances as a full force regulation, all of the municipalities wrote the ordinances as guidance which would only restrict choice of future modification of the landscape.
Board Member C: Excuse me, Hiro-chan.
Hiroshi: Yes.
Board Member C: I kind of mentioned this earlier. I want to confirm with you about the landscape [preservation]. I mean, for the last ten years, the residents of this community have petitioned to expand and improve the narrow and winding road from the port to the orphanage.
Hiroshi: Ah, ah, ah, ah
Board Member C: Every year, for the last ten years, we sent our petition to the prefectural government. And we just heard that [the prefectural government] had finally approved the budget for the expansion plan. We thought, “That’s excellent.” But, over the last two days, a member of the prefectural legislature came here, and said “There is trouble.” I said “What’s going on?” The member of legislature said, “The road renovation project is on hold now.” So, I asked him, “Under whose order?” Then, he responded, “The National Agency for Cultural Affairs wants to stop the project.” I asked him, “Why?” As you [the municipal officials] just explained, he said, “The municipal government is working to make the church World Heritage. And the road renovation could damage the landscape.” He asked me, “Have you heard about this before?” I told him back, “I’ve never heard such a thing.” Then, he said, “The city must have this information.” I was disappointed that you [the municipal officials] didn’t explain anything about it during the last community meeting [which was held two weeks prior to this community board meeting].

Hiroshi: Ah…
Board Member C: Is there any reason to hide it from us?
[author’s observation, July 15, 2008]

What this board member emphasized was how the World Heritage project would possibly interrupt preexisting projects in the community. Also, during this community board meeting, another board member expressed his concern at the possibility of restrictions on logging. What the board members expected of Hiroshi and of other municipal officials was clarification on specific local cases, such as the impact on local traffic safety (or public construction [see Woodall 1999]); further regulation that would
affect everyday practices (e.g. home renovation, fishing, farming, or logging), the specific hardships that World Heritage status would bring to the community. What the local residents expect in translation is some firm reference through which they can relate their concrete situations to the vagueness contained in global language. Contrary to the suspicion of the board members, Hiroshi and other municipal officials had not developed any detailed nominations or zoning plans. They were still struggling with the legal exuberances of the World Heritage Convention and had not yet been able to draft their preservation policy. Ironically, the officials’ inability to answer questions from the local residents made them look more suspicious, and made it difficult to articulate the convention and the lived contexts of the local residents (e.g. Mertz 2007: 339).

The degree of familiarity with the indices in the World Heritage nomination and familiarity with the application influences the flow of the communication among the actors in Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project. For the municipal officials it was more ideal to quickly discover the national officials’ indexical logic and to conceptually connect the convention and the segments of the local social contexts, so the officials could have vernacularized the World Heritage program in ways that the local residents could have easily understood. Instead, the municipal officials were too preoccupied with dealing with a flood of legal exuberances from the national and the international spheres, and, as a result, they failed to establish the indexical connections between the World Heritage program and the local residents; they simply failed to communicate with the local residents about their nomination project.

In the following three chapters, by examining three different aspects of Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, I provide ethnographic insights on the
challenges of establishing the indexical connections between an international convention and the contextual forms of social activities. Particularly in the next chapter, by focusing on how the actors in each administrative and social layer establishes the interpretation of the term *cultural landscape*, I analyze how the officials and the citizens engage in translation relay or word association games.
Chapter V: Manyuaru (Manual)

In this chapter, I analyze how the officials and citizens engage in indexical communication by focusing on how they established the interpretation of the term *cultural landscape* and how these multiple cognitive orderings ultimately intersect through the index. The individuals from each social and administrative sphere initially formed their interpretations based on the information and experiences available to them, and produced different contextually-specific meanings of cultural landscape. However, each administrative sphere could not produce radically different interpretations of cultural landscape when one of the domestic administrative spheres, the national government, was in charge of nominating their historic properties to UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee. Instead, officials struggled to find the alignment point of each cognitive order in such a way that their nomination process could progress as smoothly as possible. To avoid potential conflicts in the nomination process, therefore, the local officials often looked for a *manyuaru* (マニュアル: manual) with which they could minimize the width of interpretive deviation, and direct and align it with those of higher administrative layers.

The *manyuaru* of which I speak need not be literal or physical, but may be a conceptual and imagined guide. The officials saw a *manyuaru* as a reference point by which to effectively establish attunement with higher administrative layers (e.g. Arno 2009; Philips 1998; Richland 2008; Rommetveit 1992). In reality, a textual *manyuaru* is usually in reach of the officials. This is often the case when a new legal index is introduced to a local social context. When a *manyuaru* is not available, officials have to find alternative ways to establish mutual attunement. Such alternatives can be found in
dialogic interaction among domestic actors in a variety of places, such as neighborhood community centers, municipal halls, prefectural government offices, buildings of the national administration, or even at corners of local neighborhoods.

The product of such multiple dialogic interactions, more precisely the interactions through the legal/discursive index of cultural landscape, is not simply the dialogues of cognitive orderings. It is also a legal entity (e.g. a document, a space subject to zoning laws) which has the power of social ordering over the living space of local residents. The following ethnographic observation of verbal confrontations in a conference room in Nagasaki represents how actors from different discursive spheres try to take initiatives in the World Heritage nomination process, or try to use legal implementation to their own advantage.

*An Administratively Unaesthetic Meeting*

On August 3rd 2008, I was sitting in the back of the conference room of the Nagasaki Plaza Hotel observing the World Heritage committee meeting of the Nagasaki prefectural government (*sekai isan gakujyutsu kaigi*: 世界遺産学術会議). Since late January 2007, when the Japanese national government announced that they would include Nagasaki Catholic churches in their tentative World Heritage list, prefectural and municipal officials in Nagasaki had set up multiple administrative projects to present the official nominations to UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee. As a part of their nomination project, the prefectural government formed an academic committee in December 2007 to review and to discuss the details and the direction of their nomination project. It had already been more than a year and half since the initial national
announcement, and this meeting was their third gathering since the inauguration of the committee.

When I arrived at the hotel at the beginning of the meeting, some of the prefectural officials were visibly stressed. The actual progress of the nomination project was slower than they had previously anticipated. Even though the governor of Nagasaki prefecture had announced his intention to officially nominate the churches to UNESCO by 2011, neither the prefecture nor the municipalities had been able to determine the direction or the details of the nomination project. As if their nervous voices represented the insecurity of the prefectural officials in the room, the chief prefectural administrative staff and the committee chair opened the meeting by stating they would like to make this meeting the final one before starting the process of drafting the nomination documents for UNESCO.

Instead, the meeting quickly became contentious and progress ultimately stalled. Contrary to the expectations of the prefectural officials, this committee meeting did not function as an administrative ritual to officially mark the progress of their nomination project. Rather, the meeting became the venue for some of the prefectural committee members to publicly express their distrust of the national government, and for the national officials to explain and defend their positions.\footnote{This committee consisted of seven members, including the former preservation investigators of the Japanese national government, historians who specialized in Catholic history, and architectural engineers.} As the meeting became more untidy (or heated discussion, \textit{gekiron}: 激論)\footnote{\textit{Nagasaki Shinbun} (長崎新聞), August 23, 2008.} and, as a matter of public record, more problematic, the harsh dialogue among the prefectural committee members ironically became the venue for observers, mostly municipal officials, to understand how the national officials and prefectural officials formed different discursive spheres over the
term cultural landscape (bunka teki keikan: 文化的景観), one of the categories in the national Act on Protection of Cultural Properties (bunkazai hogo ho: 文化財保護法). The municipal officials were having a hard time understanding how to use this legal category for their World Heritage nomination project.

Throughout the World Heritage nomination project in Nagasaki, officials positioned cultural landscape as an overlapping legal/discursive index through which the legal/cognitive orderings of different administrative spheres intersected. Cultural landscape (bunka keikan: 文化景観) is a term commonly used to describe the physical representation of human-environment interactions. It is a discursive index which typically represents the cognitive orderings of the residents and the observers of their physical space. Contrary to such uses of the term, the Japanese national government introduced a more limited definition of cultural landscape to Nagasaki, a legal index of cultural landscape which indicated the existence of a legally-enforced ordering of socio-physical spaces. However, while the national office introduced cultural landscape as a legal index, the local actors in the World Heritage nomination in Nagasaki frequently formed diverse interpretations of the index. As a result, instead of providing a definite and shared understanding of the nomination project, cultural landscape became the index through which “contextually dependent forms of meanings intersect with less contextual, more conventional kinds of meaning” (Mertz 2007: 339). The conflicts at the World Heritage committee meeting in Nagasaki in August 2008 depicted this indexical dynamism between law and social life, and between local and global spheres. The committee meeting likewise depicted a segment of social continuum of the World Heritage nomination process in Nagasaki. It was the venue in which the individuals from
different administrative and discursive spheres made communicative contacts through a legal and discursive index (e.g. Agha 2005).

**Institutional Dialogue: Cultural Landscape as an Index**

In an institutional setting in which there is a high degree of division of labor, there often are not translators in charge of an entire cultural translation process. Instead, multiple individuals or units from each layer of an institution hold dialogic interactions, and constantly relay messages before finalizing their translation. The intended meanings are negotiated and reorganized in these constant dialogic interactions, and new meanings are *co-genetically* produced (Arno 2009; Austin 1962; Bakhtin 1986; Bateson 1972; Riles 1998; Rommetveit 1992; Silverstein and Urban 1996). One of the significant characteristics of cultural translation in an institutional setting is in the dialogic nature of meaning production in which the actors from each institutional unit attempt to take subtle initiatives in the co-genetic production of meanings while they act as if they are managing to attune to their counterpart.

In the process of nominating new World Heritage properties, the actors in the nomination project attempt to prove the cultural significance of prospective heritage properties while also needing to demonstrate that the nominating properties will be properly protected under the domestic legal system. Therefore, the World Heritage program is not simply a symbolic representation of a local-global culture. It is also a substantial legal network of global heritage preservation. While Japan does not have any heritage preservation laws which fully correspond with UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention, officials and local residents negotiate with one other over how to translate
the Convention within Japan’s domestic legal system. In these dialogic exchanges, the actors in the nomination project – local residents and officials from different layers of public administration, running the gamut from municipal to national – discuss each interpretation of World Heritage Convention, and negotiate how and which domestic law to use to ensure UNESCO’s guidelines on preservation. In other words, the implementation of the World Heritage Convention is not just a process of culturally translating UNESCO’s message within an international legal regime to the Japanese legal system. This implementation process is rather the dialogic interaction in which several domestic actors exchange interpretations and create original rules.

These dialogic interactions sometimes are neat and quiet, and at times become messy and chaotic. Sometimes, a group of domestic actors perfectly mirror their counterparts and establish mutual attunement (Arno 2009: 157), or they get in a messy conflict situation. As for the field researcher, instead of observing perfect mutual attunement, it was easier to identify the issues of import through the conflicts of administrative translation.

Open-Door Meeting

Back in the conference room, I reflected that it was not until almost the end of my first year of fieldwork before I could observe intense verbal sparring among the prefectural committee members. It felt strange to encounter such outright critical back-and-forth in an open-door administrative meeting. During the course of my observations, I had noticed that while closed-door meetings were typically less formatted, public officials usually spent some effort to ensure that open-door meetings would
proceed in a relatively organized manner. Some of the open-door meetings were so seamless that I wondered if these meetings were scripted. I had also observed other meetings in which the officials were trying to follow a prepared agenda and were unable to accommodate interactions with local residents (see Chapter VI). As open-door meetings were recorded and documented both by governmental and non-governmental institutions, it was important for public officials to ensure the tidiness of the meetings as much as they were able. Therefore, prior to open-door meetings, officials frequently negotiated with one another to draft out the agenda and also interacted with committee members to discuss the possible contents of the meeting. Having made these preparations, the officials often attempted to manage the overall aesthetics of the public meetings (e.g. Arno 2003), and perceived the meetings to be formal ritual processes to mark their administrative progress.

This time, instead, the committee chair was engaged in the dispute. It seemed that this open-door meeting was far from an ideal administrative ritual, and the officials and the committee members could not, by the end of the meeting, even agree to start drafting their World Heritage nomination documents. Instead of presenting this open-door meeting as a neat administrative ritual, the committee members and the officials presented to the public the range of miscommunication that existed among various administrative layers. The committee meeting exhibited the messiness that results from the multiple translations of cultural landscape, a key legal/discursive index.
Cultural Landscape: Translating the New Global Index

Over the course of the World Heritage nomination in Nagasaki, the Japanese national government initially referenced cultural landscape as a nomination project keyword when they announced their new nomination procedure in September 2006 (Cultural Affairs Council 2006). Since the early 1990s, the Japanese national government had viewed UNESCO’s World Heritage Program as a diplomatic avenue to propagate the proper understandings of Japanese culture (e.g. Hayashida 2007), and as advertising icons to attract international tourists to Japan (e.g. Government of Japan 2003; Kato 2008). As a part of this national policy, the national government issued the new World Heritage nomination procedure, and asked regional public administrations to prepare proposals if they were interested in having a World Heritage property in their prefecture. In this announcement, the national office explained their interpretation of cultural landscape by partially citing UNESCO’s Global Strategy for a Balanced, Representative and Credible World Heritage List [Global Strategy].

The national government extracted and shuffled the terms and sentences from UNESCO’s Global Strategy to explain their theory of an effective World Heritage nomination. UNESCO’s World Heritage office initially issued their intention to add cultural landscape as one of their criteria for then-future World Heritage inscription in 1994. The committee members for the Global Strategy pointed out that UNESCO’s World Heritage Program had become a collection of “monumental” architecture, and the World Heritage properties were unevenly distributed and mostly located in Europe.

---

48 WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.6
49 Ibid.
50 Section II. As of 1994, more than fifty percent of the World Cultural Heritage properties were located in Europe and North America, followed by Asia (18%) and Arab nations (12%).
Certainly, the term *culture* in UNESCO’s World Heritage Program represented (and still represents) layers of institutional powers. The public administrations of each nation-state initially evaluates and certifies the specific cultural representations within the heritage properties. The officials of the domestic spheres use their administrative power to certify the cultural aspects of the proposed properties. Additionally, UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee ultimately wields institutional power to provide certification to the proposed properties to represent what they consider to bear “Outstanding Universal Value” (UNESCO 1972). The term *cultural landscape* in the Global Strategy was presented to widen the definition of culture in the World Heritage program, and to incorporate more properties from non-European regions.\(^5\)

The Japanese national government emphasized that this regional imbalance was a result of Euro-centrism (*yohroppa chushin shugi*: ヨーロッパ中心主義), and *cultural landscape* was the concept which could redirect the World Heritage program away from such unequal regional balance in the representation of global culture (Cultural Affairs Council 2006). It also meant that the Japanese national government considered cultural landscape as an ideal index for them to nominate more World Heritage properties from Japan. Instead of providing the translation of the entire text from the Global Strategy, the Japanese national government selectively translated and entextualized sections of the Strategy, and shuffled and contextualized them in their narratives in the World Heritage nomination program. UNESCO’s plan for solving regional imbalance was interpreted as a means for the Japanese government to acquire icons to propagate and advertise their voice in international cultural politics. As UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee

---

\(^5\) In Section II of the Global Strategy, the experts classified Africa and the Pacific as such underrepresented regions. However, the Japanese national government omitted this line in their announcement in 2006.
exercised their authority in terms of evaluating this new index, cultural landscape, the Japanese national government was already exercising their institutional authority from the stage of translating and contextualizing the term in the context of the World Heritage nomination project in Japan.

Cultural Landscape as a Technique and as an Institutional Social Order

In the process of translating UNESCO’s Global Strategy, the Japanese national government primarily focused on one of the indexical aspects of cultural landscape. As an index, the Japanese national government perceived cultural landscape as a strategic technique for use in preparation of nomination documents. By framing prospective properties as a cultural landscape, government officials stated that their proposals would fit into the preferential categories of UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee (author’s field observation, October 17, 2007). Ironically, since 1994, when UNESCO introduced cultural landscape as a focused category to reduce regional discrepancies, cultural landscapes from Europe have been increasingly added to the World Heritage list. By 2008, 40 out of a total 68 cultural landscapes were located in Europe. Instead of making cultural landscape a preferential category for underrepresented regions, several European countries have used this category to their advantage. Thinking in terms of the technical aspects, the Japanese government officials suggested that regional administrators consider framing their nomination projects within the schema of cultural landscape.

52 As of August 2008, approximately 62 percent of the cultural landscapes were located in the “Europe and North American Region.” This percentage was higher then that of region’s cultural heritage properties in the entire World Cultural Heritage lists (54% as of 2007) (UNESCO 2007).
In a document or in textual format, cultural landscape is one of a technical indices which can possibly lead to UNESCO’s approval. However, although this is primarily technical jargon to the national officials for the purpose of aligning their nomination documents with UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee’s possible expectations (e.g. Riles 1998), it became more than just a discursive index for local residents. The words and the sentences which the national officials will reorganize and reshuffle to draft their nomination documents are heritage preservation policies. A heritage policy actually holds the power of social ordering. These words are not those of poems or novels. These are not just the words of interpersonal communication, with which people co-genetically establish shared meanings. These words and sentences are the rules which limit the activities of the residents in the cultural landscape. These are the words which regulate the patterns of land use. These are the words which have actual legal power over people’s real-life experiences and their physical spaces. While cultural landscape is the technical index for the national officials to prepare their nomination documents, at the same time it is a legal index which regulates the activities of the local administrators and residents. The words grip the earth’s surface and landscape and become the reference point for officials and communities to mobilize their enforcement powers.

*Importing Cultural Landscape: A Discursive Index or Spatial Ordering?*

The standard corresponding Japanese term for cultural landscape is *bunka keikan* (文化景観), which literally translates as culture (*bunka*) landscape (*keikan*), or a landscape of culture. As a *bunka keikan*, cultural landscape indicates the visible condition of the earth’s surface with traces of human intervention. *Bunka keikan* can include any
visible condition from a village in a quiet valley to a landfill used for daily waste. There is no institutional body to judge what is cultural in a landscape. Depending on an individual’s subjective standards, bunka keikan can be beautiful or ugly. Bunka (or culture), in this context, does not limit its definition to a specific aspect of social life. Bunka keikan can rather be a result of the patterns of human activities on the earth’s surface, or a temporal representation of human activities over the earth’s surface. Thus, as bunka keikan, cultural landscape usually indicates the action of observation of a landscape.

The cultural landscape in the World Heritage nomination project is of an altogether different nature from that of bunka keikan. The World Heritage nomination process is a series of institutional evaluations. There are multiple evaluation standards which limit the width of the deviation of cultural landscape while there is no absolute institutional standard to determine bunka keikan. In other words, even though cultural landscape can be translated as bunka keikan, bunka keikan does not correspond with the definition of cultural landscape in the World Heritage nomination process. They discursively inhabit the same words, but they are contextualized in two different socio-discursive spheres.

In his interview with the Japanese National Museum of Ethnology, Akihiro Kinda (金田章裕), the president of Japanese National Institute of Humanities (人間文化研究機構), commented on the background of this indexical dynamic when he chaired the process of translating UNESCO’s pragmatic definition of cultural landscape and drafted the legal category of cultural landscape into the Japanese national preservation act in 2005. Even though the broad definition of the cultural landscape in UNESCO’s Global
Strategy corresponds with the one of *bunka keikan*, the pragmatic definition of UNESCO’s cultural landscape has been determined in the series of how the World Heritage Committee have evaluated and have selected the cultural landscape properties since 1994. Similar to the continuum of case laws, UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee has created and constantly reoriented the meanings of cultural landscape through the process of their institutional evaluations. Therefore, in the process of translating the term, the Japanese national committee decided to make an indexical distinction between the cultural landscapes, which had not undergone any institutional evaluation, and those which had gone through institutional certification process though which the landscape gained the national legal status. To make this distinction, the national committee used some tricks (*kosoku na houhou*： 姑息な方法) when they legally translated *cultural landscape* according to Kinda (Kinda 2008: 4). Kinda stated that the national committee drafted the legal definition of cultural landscape as *bunka “teki” keikan* (文化的景観) only to indicate “evaluated” cultural landscapes, in contrast to the standard sense of cultural landscapes as *bunka keikan* (文化景観), which includes both aesthetic and so-called “ugly” or “messy” landscapes (Kinda 2008: 4). In the process of translating UNESCO’s pragmatic definition of cultural landscape, the Japanese national government invented the term to exclusively correspond to the narrower definition of its English counterpart.  

As *bunka teki keikan*, cultural landscape indicates the presence of the evaluators, institutional power, and forms of spatial orderings. While the cultural landscape in English remained as one indexical umbrella to

---

53 “Paysages Culturels” in French (WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.6).
hold both the analytical and pragmatic meanings, the national actors split the term and created two different Japanese terms to reflect the pragmatic differences of the two.

*Surveying “Cultural-esque” in a Landscape*

As *bunka teki keikan*, cultural landscape is a collection of legal words which the national officials reference when they engage in heritage property evaluation. It is a toolbox for officials to have when they exercise their institutional authority over the evaluation of a culture. In this sense, it can be more appropriate to translate *bunka teki keikan* back in English as *cultural-esque* (or *bunka teki*) landscape. A *cultural-esque* landscape indicates the existence of the institutional review process within itself. It is a form of landscape which holds specific contextual meanings to the reviewers. The standards of the *cultural-esque* or the standards of the aesthetics are highly context dependent. It is *cultural-esque* or *bunka teki* when the landscape can represent the narratives of the national evaluators (e.g. Befu 2001; Eriksen 2001).

Yet, the debate on *bunka teki* is not simply a philosophical or political debate. The status of gaining the index of *bunka teki* rather embodies the actual existence of legal spatial order. It is not just a collection of words or jargon which the officials and the residents in Nagasaki prefecture could randomly extract or shuffle. If the local officials in Nagasaki want to nominate the heritage properties in their region, the Catholic churches in this case, to the World Heritage Committee, the officials have to make sure that they align the condition of the local landscape, (which ultimately means the social life of the local residents) with how the Japanese national government pragmatically references *bunka teki*. The difficulty which the local officials in Nagasaki faced in this word–reality
aligning process was that almost none of the officials had encountered the legal concept of cultural landscape in their career. Cultural landscape was introduced as a new category of the Japanese national preservation policy in 2005, which was approximately two years before the officials in Nagasaki started engaging in the World Heritage nomination project. As a legal body, cultural landscape was not only an unfamiliar object for the local officials in Nagasaki, but it was also a vague institutional object for them. Therefore, local officials sought out strategies in which to clarify the vagueness of the cultural landscape concept of the World Heritage Convention and of the national preservation policy. They attempted to simulate how the higher legal framework would possibly relate to their particular local context.

In-between Specificity and Vagueness

Back in the conference room, the prefectural committee members and national committee members for the World Heritage nomination project were verbally fighting over cultural landscape. They disagreed about how to define the cultural and historic value of the landscape, and about the purpose for using the legal term for their World Heritage nomination project. All of this was information the local officials wanted to clarify before fully engaging in the nomination procedures. Therefore, the messier the meetings got and the more specific the interactions between the prefectural and the national officials became, the more information the local actors were able to gain for their nomination project.

On heritage preservation, Hisao, one of the municipal preservation specialists in Nagasaki, gave an insightful analysis while I was talking with him over the phone back
in November 2007. It was approximately one month after one of the national specialist visited Nagasaki for his initial cultural landscape survey. When I asked Hisao about the process of historic preservation, he described his job as the following:

There is a *manyuaru* (マニュアル: manual) like thing (*manyuaru mitaina mono*: マニュアルみたいなもの) for us to follow [how to register a historic property as a national heritage]. What we do is just to follow the *manyuaru* when we prepare the nomination document. We are not doing anything special. When we register a historic property with the prefecture, we just follow the prefecture’s *manyuaru*. When [we are applying] to the national, we follow their *manyuaru*. As of now, we don’t have any plan to engage in cultural landscape preservation. We haven’t been told or advised anything in detail about it. [conversation with author, November 14, 2007]

A *manyuaru* is a conceptual, imagined format which prefectural officials can follow. It lists the expected materials to prepare, the consent that needs to be obtained, and the expected narrative of a prospective preservation plan. It helps officials predict what will need to be surveyed, what data to include in the document, and which local individuals to negotiate with. With a manyuaru, local officials can also simulate strategies for future preservation, proposal writing styles, and negotiation strategies with the national officials. The manyuaru, or more precisely the *manyuaru mitaina mono*, helps local officials to interpret the vague expressions in the national preservation act in ways in which they can attune to the expectations of the national officials.

However, while they had nominated heritage buildings or artifacts to the national government, local officials and residents in Nagasaki had never before nominated a cultural landscape to become a national heritage property or nominated any part of their social sphere either to the national government or to the World Heritage Committee. Therefore, when I was in the field, there was no consensus among local officials in Nagasaki on what would be their manyuaru or manyuaru mitaina mono either for the
cultural landscape nomination or for the World Heritage nomination. While there was no
actual manyuaru, not only did the national heritage act come across as vague to the local
officials, but the entire process of the nomination seemed terribly opaque.

Moreover, a landscape is not a typical heritage commodity, but a place where
many people live their lives. While the prospective heritage certification of their
landscape could ensure the preservation of specific aspects of the social life in the
landscape, it would also regulate, restrict, or limit, the social life of the local residents. In
this sense, cultural landscape preservation is a form of zoning, which regulates specific
aspects of social practices (see Chapter IV). Urban planning policy and other zoning
regulations typically designate a few social functions that can be held on the land, so
various zones are constructed: residential zones, industrial zones, commercial zones,
farming zones, ports, and natural preservation zones. Each of these zones often
Corresponds with different legal regulations and enforcement measures. As a preservation
policy, cultural landscape is a zoning regulation which incorporates a hazy sense of
culture. Officials have to select something specific from the social life of the locals by
referencing vague legal texts, or the vague definitions of culture. They are stuck
in-between specificity and vagueness. If officials want to nominate their local space as
cultural landscape, they have to arrange meetings with the residents in the prospective
heritage areas to explain what aspect of their life the preservation law will regulate or
what kinds of benefit the law would potentially bring to them. Either directly or
indirectly, the officials have to explain to locals what it means to be cultural in the
context of heritage preservation.
Finding Clues

Therefore, the primary interest of the local officials is to find out the precise legal applications of the cultural landscape preservation policy, and make use of the vagueness within the national act (or in the culture) in drafting their heritage preservation proposals. Instead of observing a performance, or an open-door administrative meeting, local officials were more often concerned about how often they would be able to have direct interactions with the national officials, and observe how they would react to their plans and ideas. Such interactions might have been ideal if they had been frank encounters in private spaces with no schedule restrictions and no tape recordings.

An opportunity for municipal officials of Narae City, where I conducted the majority of my fieldwork, to have direct interaction with national officials initially took place in early October 2007, when a senior specialist from the national government visited Nagasaki to conduct the initial landscape evaluation. It was approximately nine months after the national government included the Catholic churches in Nagasaki as their tentative World Heritage properties in January 2007. In the City of Narae, Hiroshi, the city’s preservation specialist, guided the national specialist around the areas with the Catholic churches which the local officials were considering for inclusion in the upcoming nomination process. The excursion and its following meeting were officially closed-door venues even though local residents could spot the group of officials in semi-formal clothes taking vans and boats, and walking around the islands. For a closed-door venue, it could not have been more transparent to the public.

Such direct interactions provide a chance for the national officials to briefly determine the cultural components in the landscapes in Nagasaki according to the
interpretation of the national evaluators on the national preservation policy. It is also an opportunity for municipal officials to clarify the vagueness within the national preservation law and in World Heritage nomination policy. By keeping it a backstage venue, the officials could have a chance to relatively freely exchange their rough ideas and drafts among each other. However, such backstage venues do not guarantee whether or not officials can have productive dialogue to make the necessary immediate progress on the upcoming nomination. Rather, it was a venue in which municipal officials were able to make a laundry list of neat but legally-ambiguous sentences. Depending on how each official perceived the list, this backstage meeting could help the World Heritage nomination process to progress or could become a source of conflict between national and municipal officials.

\textit{Manyuaru or Trouble?}

Approximately one week after the October excursion, I had a chance to meet with Hiroshi at the meeting of one of the local Catholic parishes. The parish was preparing for the centennial celebration of the re-establishment of the Catholic institution in Narae island, and the meeting was intended to prepare a historic review for the centennial. Even though Hiroshi was not a Catholic, the parish asked him to be in the group because they needed help from a specialist. It was their first meeting, and there were ten people, including myself, in the room. After having a short briefing on the plan for the centennial project, the room immediately transformed into a feast. All of the documents were moved off from the table, and they were replaced by plates with sashimi (particularly fresh squid, snapper, and yellowtail freshly caught that morning), and
bottles of Asahi beer, Jack Daniels, Iki Shochu (a local premier shochu), and sake.
Against the backdrop of such a spread, one of the parish members asked Hiroshi about
the progress with the World Heritage nomination project. Since they just had a national
specialist as their administrative guest, Hiroshi started talking about what happened
during the landscape excursion with the national specialist.

It seemed that there was plenty that didn't go as expected with the national
specialist. Tangibly showing his frustration, Hiroshi started telling the people in the room
about his landscape survey excursion.

Hiroshi: It’s just too much!
Parish Member A [PM A]: What happened?
Hiroshi: I took him around the town. I took him to Dauki Church. On the way
to the church, the specialist of Bunka Cho (Japanese National
Agency for Cultural Affairs) dropped a comment, “How come this
kind of road [was built] in this kind of place [near the World
Heritage nomination area]?” Definitely, I guess that the road
wasn’t built in the ideal location in terms of the standard of the
bunka teki keikan (cultural landscape). It may be the source of
depopulation. Let me tell you, though, it surely improved the
accessibility to the area.

PM A: It is difficult. This is surely a matter of our right to subsistence
(seikatsu ken: 生活権).
Hiroshi: Then, then, the national specialist also said, “This is great. You
should include the maritime routes [in their cultural landscape
preservation proposal].” I really didn’t know what to do. I really
didn’t know what to do after the meeting last Thursday. The
specialist also said “it would be better to ask academic
professionals [to conduct a cultural landscape survey].” Thus, I
called the professors in Fukuoka right away. The professors who
visited here recently…

PM A: Hey, Hiro. You can’t just do it by yourself. [The city] has to hire at
least one more person [for the World Heritage nomination project].
Hiroshi: (With a subtle irritation in his voice and speech manner) That’s why
we are going to form a project committee for that.
PM A: I’m talking about something different, though.
Hiroshi: Wait. The city has been working on reducing the number of officials.
In the middle of this administrative downsizing, I have
concurrently at least five administrative duties; World Heritage
nomination, heritage preservation, etc. I can no longer do any of my tasks in community outreach.

PM A: What are the ones in the museum doing?
Hiroshi: They have two on staff though. Anyhow, I will be working with the staff from the city planning division [on cultural landscape preservation and the World Heritage nomination].

PM A: Yeah, it should be like that.
Hiroshi: The biggest problem right now is how to set up the core and the buffer in Kuga island.

(As soon as Hiroshi said core and buffer, everybody became extremely quiet and started to pay their attention to Hiroshi.)

PM B: What are you talking about?
Hiroshi: It means that there will be restrictions, such as building restrictions.
PM B and others: eh?
Hiroshi: Oh, well, it will be a part of the bylaw of our municipality to restrict the height of the buildings, or not to construct anything in a certain places in this municipality. By the way, I heard that Mr. Sen will be giving a talk on World Heritage.

[author’s observation, October 11, 2007]

The dialogues between the national and municipal officials could influence the nomination project in the direction that local officials had not previously considered. Municipal officials perceived the entire process of clarifying the vagueness in the national preservation policy and the World Heritage Convention as if they were dealing with a huge legal “jack-in-the-box.” Instead of receiving a solid tool to help prepare the nomination, local officials could not predict what the national specialist would say. All of the reactions of the national specialists, such as what they see, what they say, and what they explain, were clues for the cultural landscape nomination. These are manyuaru mitaina mono, something like a manual. It is actually a manual which is expressed through the utterance of the national specialists, and which contains the possible means of incorporation of the specific cultural aspects in their landscapes and a general description of cultural landscape in the national preservation policy.
There is a major difference between a manyuaru and direct interaction with national specialists. Local officials can use the manyuaru to simulate the possible effects of the prospective preservation project in consideration of their local social and political contexts before they officially inaugurate their nomination project. It does not require officially commencing any heritage nomination project if local officials or local residents just want to use the manyuaru to craft their nomination project. If the local side would like to pursue the nomination, they could predict the possible expectations of the national side by examining the manyuaru.

Instead, the manyuaru mitaina mono, which was the joint excursion with the national specialist in the case of Narae, took place more than a year after the municipality filed their initial World Heritage nomination proposal to the national government. They did not have the manyuaru when they prepared their initial proposal. In fact, the municipal officials, including Hiroshi, admitted that they did not try to align or arrange their proposal either to accommodate then-existing local socio-political contexts to what the national office would possibly be expecting. Therefore, even though the officials in Narae finally "got" the manyuaru mitaina mono in October 2007 by having the national specialist visit their municipality, the visit itself became more troubling for locals than simply an opportunity to have a manyuaru. The World Heritage nomination project was already at the point of no return. It was already a national project to nominate the Catholic churches in Nagasaki as a World Heritage property.
Still, the excursion did not guarantee that the local officials would accept what
the national specialist found to be cultural in the landscape of Narae. During the
conversation in the church meeting room, Hiroshi indicated that the measurement of
cultural in cultural landscape preservation, or bunka teki keikan, would largely depend on
the national evaluation standard, and would not be a result of the random activities of
locals' social lives on the landscape, bunka keikan. Hiroshi and the parish members were
uncomfortable with the national standard, some of which were presented in the national
specialist’s critiques, such as his critique on road construction. Such public construction
project had been the major economic engine in the area, and was a campaign base for
most local politicians, including the mayor and city councils. Allocating a public funding
to the companies with large numbers of employees had secured their political positions
(see Chapter II). Construction companies had been one of the major pressure groups in
local politics. Therefore, Hiroshi and some of the parish members at the meeting took the
national specialist’s critique of road construction as a threat not only to their public
service but even their occupations (see Chapter IV and VII).

In fact, the landscape in Narae, as with most of the landscapes around the world,
is a representation of local politics. The visual condition of the landscape in Narae is the
result of how the politicians and officials sought their political support by allocating their
public funding to supporters. No only were the roads and the public facilities built and
maintained by construction companies, but farms were also modified and maintained by
the local farmers’ cooperative, which was one of the largest political pressure groups in
Japan. Therefore, the cultural landscape preservation was more than just a cultural
preservation. It meant that the preservation project was entering a local political sphere. As a preservation specialist, Hiroshi had mainly dealt with preserving historic buildings and artifacts, and wanted to avoid anything related to local politics.\textsuperscript{54} The suggestions of the national specialist were surely manyuaru for their World Heritage nomination. However, it was just more than a commentary on the \textit{cultural} in the socio-political context in Narae. Instead, Hiroshi and the parish members interpreted the comment as a loaded political statement, which subtly suggested a dramatic change in local political structure.

\textit{Negotiating the Attunement}

However, for the national officials and the municipal officials, this initial excursion was already a major step for them to start their dialogic interactions. Since this initial joint excursion, the Narae city government started periodically having meetings with the national specialists. The meetings were held both at the national office in Tokyo or in various the municipal halls in Nagasaki depending on their schedules.

While some of the municipal officials interpreted the national officials’ attitude as unbearably authoritative, the national side did later propose the possibilities of attunement by respecting the socio-political contexts of local communities. For example, when the officials of the Narae city invited another national specialist to give a more detailed lecture on the national cultural landscape policy, the specialist explained, at the end of his presentation, that the national government would provide several funding

\textsuperscript{54} Preservation specialists in other municipalities typically worked on archaeological surveys, which Hiroshi was relatively reluctant about. These specialists considered archaeological work to be highly political activities. By conducting their archaeological surveys and filing administrative reports, other specialists considered their mission to be a fight against unnecessary development (see Chapter VII for more ethnographic description).
options not only for landscape preservation but also for landscape restoration (author’s observation, December 20, 2007). During her lecture, the national specialist emphasized that the cultural landscape preservation policy was not intended to radically change the existing social life of the local residents. She repeatedly stated that the cultural landscape preservation was a system for locals to voluntarily use to improve their social life. If locals did not want to use it, that would also be their choice. According to the national specialist, even though national cultural preservation policy was a regulatory system over the earth's surface, it would not automatically ban all future construction. In fact, during her lecture, the national specialist emphasized that the national government did have funding programs for future landscape restoration projects (shu kei: 修景), which would require construction companies to demolish non-ideal landscape components. Since the landscape restoration would be a public project, such national funding projects would have to go through the existing administrative structure. The specialist stressed this point that the cultural landscape preservation project was not meant to radically change the existing local socio-political structure.

While the first national specialist mainly focused on providing his commentary on the possible national cultural components in the local landscape of Narae, the second national specialist’s presentation provided more information on how to use and to articulate the national cultural landscape preservation policy in local social activities, including such helpful aspects as how to set up a timeline for the nomination, strategies for holding public meetings, and possible sources of funding for the nomination project. The national specialist designed the lecture in such a way that the national government was seen as providing support while the local side engaged in the cultural heritage
nomination. It was presented so that both sides could find a point of mutual attunement in the cultural landscape nomination project.

Having multiple indexical shifts, the term cultural landscape from UNESCO’s World Heritage program finally got to the initial stage of translation in the social context of Narae. Even though the concept was not fully introduced or presented to the local residents, the new social meanings were attached to the term as the term went through various layers of administrative bodies. The actors from each administrative layer reacted to the introduction of this new legal index and debated how to interpret and articulate cultural landscape in their existing administrative sphere. Interestingly in the case in Narae, one of the emphases of the national cultural landscape preservation was translated more about the possibility of its direct financial gain, with which the local officials could possibly keep feeding local political pressure groups. In the process of administrative translation, culture in the cultural landscape preservation was reframed within the local administrative context, and provided the locals with a high degree of authority within what can be superficially considered as a mutual attunement.

Back in the Conference Room, August 2008

After the national specialist’s lecture in December 2007, the officials from each municipality in Nagasaki worked on crafting their cultural landscape nomination projects, which could possibly connect with the upcoming World Heritage nomination. By the end of the 2007 fiscal year (in March of 2008), all of the seven municipalities in the World Heritage nomination project officially filed their proposal and publicly announced their intention to make landscape preservation their administrative project. Back in the
conference room in the Nagasaki Plaza Hotel, approximately seven months after the
national specialist’s lecture in Narae, the prefectural committee chair was engaged in
deliberations with the national official. Either not knowing much about these proceeding
administrative dialogues, or personally forgetting the briefings from some of the
municipal officials, the chair repeatedly insisted that cultural landscape preservation was
an unnecessary task in terms of nominating the Catholic churches to UNESCO’s World
Heritage Committee. This messy dispute in the open-door meeting drew a key comment
from the national side. Nobu, one of the committee members for the prefectural
government who was also serving on the World Heritage committee of the Japanese
national government, interrupted the chair and commented:

As I previously said, before officially sending the final proposal to
UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee, all of the properties [in the proposal]
have to be registered under the national heritage preservation act. Some of the
churches would not be able to be national heritage properties in and of
themselves. Instead, the national cultural landscape preservation act can
include such churches in its preservation zone. Therefore, even though [the
national government] would register the churches as parts of the cultural
landscape, it would not mean that these cultural landscapes would directly be
nominated as World Heritage properties. [author’s observation, August 3,
2008]

Nobu’s speech manner was slightly pedagogical even though the tone of his voice was
calm. By starting his statement with the phrase, “As I previously said,” he was expressing
his frustration at the prefectural committee for not being able to align their ideas with that
of the national government. Instead of producing a consensus among the committee
members and the officials in the conference room, the prefectural committee chair
became even more upset and started criticizing the unreasonableness of the national
guidelines for the official World Heritage nomination.
While the local officials and the national officials were trying to find out how to socially translate cultural landscape into a legal concept and practice in the social contexts of the local socio-politics, the national committee member commented that the translation efforts of the local side were practically equated to the preparation of the legal document. The implementation of the cultural landscape preservation was a process of transforming local socio-legal/socio-political conditions into a textual format, which the officials would later be able to extract and shuffle to construct their narratives for the final World Heritage nomination. Coming down from the global sphere to the local sphere in Japan, the World Heritage Convention has gone through multiple indexical shifts. Yet, this process was just one side of the World Heritage nomination process. After the Convention is translated in the local socio-political context, it will go back from the local to the global. In this process, the words and the sentences will be technically reframed and reorganized to meet with the expectations of the global sphere (e.g. Riles 1998).

Having gone through such a translation process, another preservation specialist from Shonega Town, Yoshi, commented that the World Heritage nomination could no longer be the priority of their preservation project. Yoshi commented:

It is not certain that this place will really become a World Heritage. If we only think about making this place as a World Heritage but pay less attention to the social life in this town, it [the nomination project] would just not work out at all. Now we are working on this cultural landscape preservation project. We are thinking and working to use this system to revitalize this town. We are focusing on it. If the World Heritage comes as one of possible side effects, that would be nice though. [conversation with author, June 4, 2010]

When I talked to Yoshi, he was almost done preparing the final draft of the cultural landscape preservation policy which his town was going to submit to the national
government. His comment implied that even though the final outcome might look like a smooth translation of local culture to global culture and vice-versa, the actuality was rather a discontinuation of various aspects of social life between the local and global.

In summary, administrative translation in Nagasaki reflects the limits of translation. To effectively send a specific message and to selectively choose a few aspects from an original context, translators often have to decide to ignore other aspects from the same context. Selected messages will reach their audience, but the message will already be modified to fit the context of the audience. As the cultural landscape was selectively translated through dialogic interactions from global to local, the local context will be selectively translated from the local to the global. The manyuaru is a representation of Japanese administrative culture, which is shared and negotiated by those from national, prefectural, and municipal levels. In the next chapter, by focusing on the performative aspect of administrative culture, how manyuaru ironically alienates residents from policy-making processes under the guise of community participation.
Chapter VI: Performing Community Participation

In this chapter, by focusing on the performative aspect of the public meetings of the local administrations, I critically explore how Japanese officials, armed with their conventional, manyuaru-centered translations of the concept of community participation, put the new conventions into practice. I ask: how do they put newly-formed, dialogically-processed conventions into context during the process of nominating the Catholic churches in Nagasaki as prospective World Heritage properties? It is the emphasis of performance over communication that accomplishes this.

By emphasizing the effectiveness of small government, the LDP implemented policies by which the national administration transferred administrative responsibilities to prefectural and municipal governments (e.g. Kadomatsu 2007). However, without defining community, nor explaining what it stands for, politicians and supporters used neoliberal ideological sound bites by praising such policies as bringing good old community values back to society and providing choices and responsibilities of community and individual autonomy (e.g. Cole 2004). The emphasis on community participation or community development, often a top-down endeavor, can also be seen in multicultural spectacles of celebration in international venues as well. The invocation of community in managed performances is less an attempt to communicate with said community, but represents shared tools and techniques of public administrations.
In Western China

The emphases on community participation or community development have been the focus and the justification of recent international venues. For example, the organizers of the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics tried to portray the inclusiveness of the communities of the First Nations in British Columbia and other parts of Canada. The organizers of the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympics tried to represent a harmonious collaboration (和谐) of China’s diverse ethnic populations, while the government was simultaneously trying to detain or expel civil rights activists from the country. The 16th International Congress of and Ethnological Sciences (ICAES) was postponed for one year, but held in Kunming, China in July 2009 with an overstated celebration of harmonious ethnic collaboration in the country (Figure 17). And finally, organizers of the 2010 World Cup Soccer Match in South Africa were criticized for ordering production of memorabilia from Chinese companies, and not from South African factories, which was supposed to help develop South African communities. UNESCO’s World Heritage project also responded to such

Figure 13: A photographic display of China’s ethnic harmony at the 16th ICAES meeting in Kunming, China. Even though it says “共同团结奋斗 共同繁荣发展” (Together struggle united, Together develop prosperously) at the top left side of the picture, most of the individuals were photoshopped in to make it look as if they were smiling in front of Tiananmen Square (photo taken on July 30, 2009).
international trends of community inclusion by implementing a new guideline of 2005, which encouraged member states to secure community participation during the nomination process.

The World Heritage nomination project in Nagasaki was taking place in the midst of international debate on community inclusion along with the neoliberal trends of Japanese administrative reform. To meet expectations of both the national and international spheres, the Nagasaki prefectural government and the municipalities had to arrange some evidence of community participation before presenting their nomination proposal to the World Heritage Committee. To carry this out, government officials organized public symposiums in Nagasaki’s five municipalities. However, even though such public symposia were officially advertised to provide opportunities for residents to participate in the nomination process, it seems as if the symposium organizers were more focused on following a set format than in actually having public participation (e.g. Phillips 1998). In retrospect, the format of the symposia, I thought, somewhat resembled the format of American late night talk shows. Rather than trying to arrange to get input from local residents, or rather than trying to directly communicate with the floor, the organizers seemed to be trying to follow a fixed procedure (e.g. Arno 2003; Bell 1997; Conley and O’Barr 1998; Phillips 1998). It was as if I was watching some American television talk show with another audience in the community hall. As formalized rituals and television shows, the symposium seemed highly prepared and scripted (e.g. Cole 2004; Comaroff and Comaroff 1993; Kertzer 1988).

This analogy came to me when I was in China with my wife while she was conducting her fieldwork there between 2008 and 2010. While we were living in China,
it required some effort to access international information sources. Due the multiple Tibetan protests in 2008 and 2009, the Beijing Olympic in 2008, the ethnic violence against the Uyghur factory workers in Guangdong and the corresponding ethnic tension in Xinjiang in 2009, and the sixtieth anniversary of the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 2009, the Chinese government adopted strict control over the Internet information flow. Many major American internet social networks became inaccessible from China such as YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook.\textsuperscript{55} Being addicted to the internet, I was initially frustrated to be in such an internet dystopia, and frequently complained about it to my wife. In such an environment, what I enjoyed was to manage watching American late night television shows. Having a background as a network administrator, I could get out of the Chinese internet circuit, and frequently enjoyed watching the political jokes by the American talk show hosts.\textsuperscript{56} This became one of the main venues by which I kept in touch with up-to-date American socio-politics while I was living in China.

Watching these American late night talk shows on the internet from China, I recalled the time when I was conducting my fieldwork in the Santo archipelago of Nagasaki as local officials were trying to figure out how to nominate Catholic churches

\textsuperscript{55} Probably, I did not need these social internet services when I was writing my dissertation, perhaps I should have thanked the Chinese government for blocking these websites for me.

\textsuperscript{56} The inaccessibility to some of the American websites was not only due to control by the Chinese state. For example, most of the major American television networks restrict access to their online content from outside the US due to copyright protection (Japanese network television also restrict the access to their online contents). They check the internet user’s location via the IP address. Chinese video-sharing websites such as Youku (优酷) and Tudou (土豆网) also started blocking access from Japanese and Korean IP addresses from January 6, 2009. Though the US and the Japanese media expressed that action should be taken to prevent copyright infringement, the Japanese media speculated that the managers of Chinese video-sharing websites blocked access to avoid legal allegations from Japanese and Korean media over unauthorized use of Japanese and Korean videos posted on their websites. For example, as of March 19, 2010, the episode of the Tonight Show with Conan O’Brian (which aired in the US on November 19, 2009) on Youku, in which O’Brian made fun of how the Chinese media did not broadcast the comments on internet freedom by the US president, Barack Obama, during the town hall meeting in Shanghai on November 16, 2009.
as World Heritage properties. More precisely, they were working to secure “proof” of community participation and demonstrable evidence that they made efforts to interact with local residents on the World Heritage nomination project. I noticed that one of their standard methods to achieve this administrative aim was to host public symposia in the municipalities of the prefecture to inform residents of the nature and the purpose of the World Heritage nomination project. The prefectural government started hosting such symposia after the completion of the process meant to reflect local opinions; the national government had already selected the prospective World Heritage properties in January 2007 (Council for Cultural Affairs 2007). If local opinions around Nagasaki had already been taken into account, why were such symposia needed? All of the public symposia followed the same format; music performance, keynote lecture, dialogue style presentation, and Q&A sessions.

In Narae City, the site where I conducted the majority of my fieldwork, the symposium was held more than a year after the national selection, on February 17, 2008. The venue was the local auditorium, the Narae Cultural Hall (narae bunka kaikan: 奈良文化会館), which has a seating capacity of around one thousand people. This is the auditorium that local administration and civic groups usually use for occasions such as the citywide singing performance competition, creative art performances exhibits by local grade school students, or even musical performances of nationally popular musicians. In such a large auditorium, I wondered, how would the officials interact with the audience? In other words, what would it really mean to arrange to have public participation? The setting and the format of the public symposium made me wonder about the rationale, procedures, and strategies of the government officials with regard to
public participation. Why did the officials have to host the symposium? How did they structure its format, and how did they manage the interaction with the local residents during and after the symposium?

The public demand for the inclusion of their opinion in the process of zoning and community development had been an issue since the 1950s when development and pollution became national problems (e.g. Apter and Sawa 1986; Kadomatsu 2007; Kidder and Miyazawa 1993; Kidder 1997; McKean 1981; Upham 1987). Both in rural and urban Japan, various campaigns were held by civil rights activists, pressuring local public administrators and legislators to implement stricter environment monitoring systems (e.g. Upham 1987). Some used litigation to seek ways for their voices to be included in their own community management (e.g. Kadomatsu 2007; Kidder and Miyazawa 1993; Kidder 1997; Kitamura 2006; Nakajima 2007). Zoning and environment-related disputes, sometimes accompanied by civil disobedience in Japan, have challenged the discourse of the harmonious Japanese society, and have especially been the focus of heated debate among scholars of Japanese law and society (e.g. Apter and Sawa 1986; Chiba 1989; Haley 1987; Levin 1999; Kidder and Miyazawa 1993; Kidder 1997; Upham 1987; 1998).

Since the late 1990s, the Japanese national administration has put a stronger rhetorical emphasis on the important role of the citizens in public policy management. However, at this time, the background context was quite different from the previous civil disputes or struggles for public participation. The national Cabinet started using community or traditional family values as a theme of their political rhetoric while engaging in nationwide administrative reform to reduce their expenditures. By emphasizing the effectiveness of the small government, LDP, which had dominated
politics up until the 2009 national election, implemented the policies by which the national administration transferred administrative responsibilities to regional and municipal governments (e.g. Kadomatsu 2007). However, without defining community, nor explaining what it stands for, politicians and supporters tried to spread neoliberal ideological values by praising such policies as bringing good old community values back to society and providing the choice and the responsibilities of community and individual autonomy (e.g. Cole 2004).

**Interest in World Heritage Status**

A former project director of the Japan National Tourist Organization [JNTO] (日本政府観光局), Ei’ichi Kato (加藤 英一) stated in one of his retirement lectures that JNTO considered the World Heritage properties in Japan as one of the key sales components to attract international tourists. Kato stated that the organization had observed that the tourists had a tendency to the visit places which match with their preexisting images of Japan. Showing the World Heritage calendars which JNTO made in 2006 on his PowerPoint Presentation, Kato implied that the images of the World Heritage functioned to attract the attention of the prospective visitors, and it could function to bring economic incentive to Japanese cities and rural areas. In January 2003, as one of his national economic stimulus projects, a former Japanese Prime Minister, Jun’ichiro Koizumi, announced his plan to double the number of inbound tourists by 2010. As a self-proclaimed reformer (and often referred to as a neoliberal politician),

---

57 Ei’ichi Kato’s retirement keynote lecture “Tourism Policy of Japan,” at the University of Tsukuba on January 30, 2008.
58 156th Ordinal National Diet Session.
Koizumi made this announcement in tandem with other plans to reform government and economy to push Japan to recover from the decade long post-Bubble economic recession. The Japanese national administration stressed that the imbalance of inbound/outbound tourists to/from Japan had been a serious drag on the ailing Japanese economy. The total number of inbound tourists was only one-third that of the outbound tourists in 2001; the national Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism estimated that Japan’s deficit in international tourism was approximately US$ 29.4 billion (Government of Japan 2002). The national government emphasized that a systematic international campaign to increase international inbound tourism could be a vehicle to improve the sour Japanese national economy. The World Heritage program was contextualized as a tool in such a national economic policy, and seen as the tourism advertisement tool as well as the tool for regional economic revitalization.

I arrived in Japan in August 2007 when the Japanese national government had just implemented the system to make World Heritage nomination their official regional development policy. World Heritage was certainly used as the medium for regional development while I was conducting my fieldwork in Japan. Watching the national television networks, browsing through the travel guidebooks in the bookstores, or passing by the ticket office of train stations in Japan, I frequently bumped into advertisements promoting World Heritage tours. The covers of the brochures usually depicted images of elaborate and magnificent monuments such as the Tower of London, the Wartburg Castle,

59 Approximately 4,770,000 inbound tourists visited Japan in 2001 while 16,220,000 Japanese traveled outside Japan (Government of Japan 2003).
60 JPY 3.5 trillion (the currency exchange rate was JPY 118.95 to US$ 1.00 as of January 2003, according to the Bank of Japan).
61 By citing the statistics of the World Tourism Organization (WTO), which placed Japan’s inbound tourism as 35th in the world, Japanese national administration identified Japan as one of the developing nations in international tourism industry (Government of Japan 2002).
and the shrines and the temples in Kyoto. The tourism-centered regional revitalization project was set in motion when the national administration called for proposals from the regional governments to nominate their tentative World Heritage properties in September 2006.

The Nagasaki prefectural government almost immediately responded to this national project and sent their proposal to the national office in association with seven municipalities in the prefecture. Officials in Nagasaki nominated the Catholic churches in the prefecture, and their proposal became one of four proposals selected in this first national World Heritage proposal competition in Japan. Since the national selection in Nagasaki, World Heritage status was portrayed more as an avenue to bright regional community revitalization around the prefecture. Prefectural administrators vowed that it was urgent to successfully secure World Heritage status to lift the region out of economic depression. The governor of the prefecture vowed to the media that they would officially make a nomination to UNESCO by 2010, and aimed to achieve World Heritage status by 2011.

Administratively Retrospective, Socially Prospective: Nature of the Symposium

In the announcement on the result of national selection on January 23, 2007, the national office emphasized that “When [we] add cultural heritage properties to the [national] World Heritage Tentative List, the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders [such as the site managers of the cultural heritage properties and local and regional governments] is encouraged (Article II.C sec. 64 “Operational Guideline”).

---

62 This nomination system only lasted for two years until 2008.
64 Ibid.
Therefore, when we add cultural heritage properties to our nation’s World Heritage Tentative List, it is necessary to adapt a new method to gain consent from *chiiki* (local community) including such parties.\(^65\) The World Heritage nomination procedure of 2006/2007 was different from the previous World Heritage nomination procedure. While the national office previously made their tentative lists and negotiated with regional governments on whether or not they would officially consider nominating historic heritages as World Heritage properties, the national office sought proposals from the regional administrations in the 2006/2007 nomination procedure. Therefore, the procedure was presented as more of a voluntary and democratic process to reflect the opinions of the residents. In other words the national office did not force the regional and local offices to simply agree on their plan nor did they unilaterally establish a plan in Tokyo. Regional administrations voluntarily nominated proposals to the national office and were supposed to have arranged consent from the local stakeholders before filing their proposals.

According to this logic, when Nagasaki prefecture sent their proposal to the national government, they were supposed to have already arranged consent from the local stakeholders. At this stage, prefectural officials created two kinds of realities in the nomination process; the administrative/legal reality and the social one. In terms of

\(^{65}\) 「世界遺産暫定一覧表への文化資産の記載に当たっては、文化資産の直接の保存管理担当者、地方公共団体など、広範囲にわたる関係者の参加が呼びかけられている（「作業指針」第64節）。したがって、我が国の世界遺産暫定一覧表に文化資産を追加記載する場合には、これらの関係者をも含め、地域における合意形成を踏まえた新たな手法を導入することが必要となっている。」

"On the Result of the Research/Discussion by the National World Cultural Heritage Committee" [1 (1) U] published by the Japanese National Agency for Cultural Affairs on January 23, 2007 (世界文化遺産特別委員会における調査・審議の結果について[1 (1) ユ]). The national government justified that they designed this policy to correspond with UNESCO’s guidelines. In section 1 (1) U of the national announcement, the national government cited Section 64 of the UNESCO World Heritage Operational Guideline of 2005. Section 64 of the Operational Guideline states: “State Parties are encouraged to prepare their Tentative Lists with the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders, including site managers, local and regional governments, local communities, NGOs and other interested parties and partners.”
collecting the consent, the prefectural officials legally made arrangements with the representative of the heritage properties. As the prefectural officials were going to propose the Catholic churches, the officials contacted the archbishop of the local Catholic archdiocese. While the archbishop was the key religious figure of the local Catholic community, he also legally represented the local archdiocese which was a religious corporation (shukyo hojin: 宗教法人) and a legal person (hojin: 法人) under the Japanese legal system. As the figurehead of the local Catholic archdiocese, the archbishop had an incredible influence on the decision-making process of the organization and he also had the authority to give the consent of the people in the archdiocese to the prefecture. The local Catholic archbishop agreed to support the prefectural officials’ plan to nominate the heritage Catholic churches as prospective World Heritage property.

However, such legal/administrative reality did not fully correspond with the social reality in Nagasaki. Prior to the national announcement in January 2007, World Heritage nomination had never been the official administrative agenda among officials in Nagasaki. Rather, public officials were reluctant to become involved in any World Heritage nomination movement. Since 2002, there has been a group of local elites in Nagasaki promoting the Catholic churches in the prefecture to be World Heritage properties. This group had approximately 80 members, but it was not quite a grassroots movement, nor was their idea organized in a way it could be implemented as an actual

---

66 At the public forum on March 25, 2008, the archbishop stated to the audience, “Two years ago, ooh, in September, I think it was already in October, eeh, [the officials of] the Nagasaki prefectural government, eeh, told me such and such, eeh, and told me that they wanted to send their proposal to the national government, and [we/I] had to respond back [to the prefectural government] before November. (With stress in his voice) [we/I] only had approximately one month. Deeh, now that I think about it, I’m sorry to the congregations and the priests, but we didn’t have enough time to discuss this issue [with the congregation and the priests].” [author’s observation, March 25, 2008].

67 Ibid.
administrative policy (Kakimori 2005). Also, no preservation regulations were implemented in Nagasaki specifically for appropriate World Heritage nomination. By the time of national selection in January 2007, eleven Catholic churches and historic sites were registered under the national heritage preservation law. The government did not have the consent from the actual property owners or the users. They also did not have consent from residents living near the churches, whose living space would also be regulated as World Heritage Buffer Zones. Instead of encouraging actual community participation in the nomination process, the prefecture initially alienated (or detached) the legal reality away from the social reality (municipal officials knew of this gap, and were frustrated by the prefectural officials).

The actual social context in Nagasaki was that the prefecture and the municipalities were still at the stage before engaging in the public awareness campaigns. While I was conducting my fieldwork, local public officials were relatively reluctant, or more precisely, they expressed that they were not sure what they had to do or what they had to explain to their constituents. They did not officially start any legal preparation for the World Heritage nomination in terms of collecting actual consent from the possible stakeholders other than the head of the local Catholic diocese. By the day of the symposium on February 17, 2008, I had lived on the island for almost half a year, and had noticed that the majority of the islanders more or less knew that the government intended to nominate the local churches as the World Heritage properties. The local government had posted a banner in the local ferry port stating “Nominate World Heritage properties from Narae” (奈良江から世界遺産を！), designed a logo with an image of a church, which frequently appeared in local newspapers and community bulletins. The
public administration also started a half-page column in the municipal bulletin on the
history of the local Catholics. The officials seemed to be expecting such banners, flyers,
and symposia would connect the two realities (administrative and social). A week
before the symposium, the Narae municipal government and the symposium sponsors
displayed posters at municipal facilities, community centers, Catholic churches (but not
at Protestant churches, Buddhist temples or Shinto shrines), and the walls of local
retailers. This poster was also distributed as a flyer by local newspaper distributors. The
public symposium could function to realign the detachment between the legal reality and
social reality within the Nagasaki World Heritage nomination. Even though the venue
would function retrospectively in the actual administrative process, it could have been an
occasion for prefectural officials and the residents to share information and exchange
opinions. Instead, the organizers had prepared the event in the way to align the social
reality to the administrative reality.

Before the Symposium

The symposium was scheduled to begin at 1:30PM, February 17, 2008. I arrived
at the Narae Cultural Hall approximately ten minutes before the scheduled time. The
auditorium of the Narae Cultural Hall could accommodate approximately one thousand
people. The Narae Cultural Hall was a government funded multi-purpose facility, which
had a similar function with but smaller size than a convention center in North America.
Such multi-purpose facilities in Japan are government funded most municipalities have

68 Approximately one month after the national announcement, Nagasaki prefecture passed the budget for
hosting symposiums for the 2007/2008 fiscal year, which they had not allocated before the national
selection. The prefectural government explained that the budget was for administrative projects with the
nomination and to raise public awareness on the nomination for immediate official nomination.
one of such facilities. While the convention centers in major cities of North America usually have multiple large-size auditoriums and meeting rooms, *shimin kaikan* in Japan usually consist of large multi-purpose auditorium which can hold one to two thousand people, along with a meeting room or two. For smaller gatherings, these auditoriums are quite similar to a classic movie theater in shape. In such a large space, I wondered how officials would interact with local residents. Even if the purpose of the venue was to inform the residents of the progress of their World Heritage nomination project, as the name of the venue was set as *symposium* (*shinpojiroomu*: シンポジウム), I wondered if the residents would have the sense to be fully informed in such a large community hall. The symposium organizers had opened the Cultural Hall and the auditorium at one o’clock, so some people were in the hallway perusing official colorful processual displays on heritage churches with photographs. The displays dealt with the 20 churches the prefecture had listed in the November 2006 proposal submitted to the national office. Prefectural officials were also handing out A4 size envelopes containing the schedule for the symposium, a PR brochure of their World Heritage nomination project, membership form for the newly established preservation non-profit organization, and a one-page response survey form on the symposium which had been prepared by the municipal board of education.

Right at the door of the auditorium, I bumped into Atsu. Atsu was a municipal official whom I became acquainted with in a local volleyball team. Atsu was in the environment management section of Narae’s government so his assignment was not directly related to the World Heritage nomination, which was mainly the responsibility of
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69. The prefectural government and their think tank recycled these church displays for different symposia venues which they held between October 2007 and March 2008.
the municipal board of education. Right away, Atsu told me, “We [municipal officials] were ordered to come to this symposium. Today, sixty of us are in the audience. I guess we have to become familiar with the World Heritage issues as public servants, I guess,” (conversation with the author, February 17, 2008). The following day, Nagasaki Shinbun reported that approximately 500 people attended this symposium (Nagasaki Shinbun, February 18, 2008). Even if this number was taken to be correct, almost sixteen percent of the “public” actually consisted of municipal officials (The actual percentage could be higher than sixteen percent as I believe 500 is an overestimate. The spectator seats were more than fifty percent vacant, as far as I calculated during the symposium. Only 140 people submitted the response form which the municipality had given to the audience). Such an administrative order and the auditorium setting had already seemed to be taking such components as community participation and even the legitimacy as the information session away from the venue even before the actual event was going to start.

As I entered the auditorium, I noticed nine television cameras. Six of them were on tripods and the three of them were without. In the auditorium, I also saw Akio, an official from a neighboring island municipality. The prefectural government also included heritage churches from his municipality in their proposal. Akio was serving in the tourism development office of the municipality and had organized “healing” tour plans to visit historic churches in the municipality. As soon as I saw Akio, he pointed at the schedule of the symposium and said, “Can you believe this?” Akio was pointing the musical performers on the schedule. It was the Otake Philharmonic Chorus, one of the local amateur choirs in the island. Akio continued, “Some of the residents in my island were complaining why, why the organizers could not arrange anything better.” What
Akio was criticizing that the musical performer of the day was not a major draw compared to other prefectural symposia. At the three of the previous symposia, the prefectural government hired professional musicians, but here it only invited a local amateur choir to attract audience to the Narae symposium.  

Earlier in October 2007, one of the local municipal officials in Narae explained that arranging such musical performance for the symposium would be unnecessary (conversation with author, October 17, 2007). According to this official, the organizer from the prefectural office told the municipal government that they had a standard format for the symposium; live music performance, keynote lecture, and panel discussion within two and half hours. The prefectural officials justified that they could attract the residents to the symposium with a music performance. The municipal official commented that he did not think it was a good idea to have a music performance at the symposium. Instead, he thought that it would be better to allocate more time to explaining the nature of this World Heritage nomination project. Instead of not inviting a professional musician, or instead of allocating more time for another component of the symposium, the prefecture ended up inviting a local amateur choir to be part of the symposium.

According the handout, the schedule of the symposium was slightly modified from prefecture’s “standard” symposium format. Instead of opening the meeting with a musical performance, the mayor was going to address opening speech. After the mayor’s speech, Yokyu Koden, a professor of Preservation Studies of the Network University, would give a keynote lecture titled, “Form Regional ‘Treasure’ to Global ‘Treasure’”.

---

70 For the symposium in the city of Minami-Shinabara on October 7, 2007, the prefectural government invited a professional instrumental group, Deux Marchés. For the symposium in the city of Sasebo (February 2, 2008) and Hirado (February 3, 2008), the government also arranged a professional singer and radio MC, Reiko Sada as a music performer.
域の「たからもの」から世界の「たからもの」へ, followed by a musical performance and a four member panel discussion. Even though there was a slight change in the order, the symposium still contained three core components: keynote lecture, musical performance, and panel discussion. On the schedule, the keynote speech was portrayed as the core of the symposium. Including the preceding symposia in three other municipalities, the prefectural government gave the same title, “Making regional treasure global,” as the keynote lecture. As the keynote lecture, the prefectural government arranged for university professors to explain the cultural and historic significance of the Catholic churches in the municipality or talk about the issues of heritage preservation.

Along with the contents of the keynote lecture, it was evident that prefectural government officials were quite concerned about the format of the lecture and the panel discussion.

As the term panel discussion (パネルディスカッション) indicated, the prefectural officials intentionally selected a dialogic presentation style. Including the symposium in Narae city, the prefectural organizers had panel discussions in all of the five World Heritage symposia which they hosted between October 2007 and March 2008. In three other symposia, keynote lectures were also given in a dialogue style between the keynote speaker and prefectural officials. One of the officials explained their reason for using this dialogic presentation style in public symposia. He thought that an audience might get bored or tired if the speakers gave a non-interactive lecture to them. According to this official, it would be much easier and less tiring for the audience to follow

71 For the symposium in the city of Minami-Shimabara, Dr. Takashi Gono, a professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo, gave a lecture on the history of the Catholicism around the Shimabara peninsula, and Professors Atsuko Hosoda and Tsutomu Kataoka of Nagasaki International University spoke about their ideas on heritage preservation at Sasebo (February 2, 2008) and Hirado (February 3, 2008).
something dialogic (conversation with author, October 8, 2007). The interactions among
the keynote speakers and the panel members were not fully improvised. The general
outlines, topics to cover, and questions were prepared ahead of the symposium, even
though some of the local panel members had to improvise their responses on-stage. The
organizers of the symposium in Narae prepared the format and the questions well before
the symposium started, and also anticipated possible reactions from the audience.
Multiple television cameras were in the auditorium. Furthermore, the World Heritage
symposium in Narae had sixty of the staff (municipal officials) sitting in spectator seats
as part of the audience. Also, at the Narae symposium, the audience was expecting to
actually interact with the keynote speaker or panel members during a Q&A session. The
venue was set. Whatever the audience expectations were for the symposium, it was time
for the officials to start the World Heritage administrative ritual.

*Unexpected Spectacle/Expected Surprise*

As soon as the symposium started, it seemed as if all the preparation effort, which
the prefectural officials had invested, was going to be for naught. The mayor of Narae,
who was also one of the discussants of the scheduled panel discussion, spent
approximately twelve minutes of her opening remarks talking about her thoughts on the
globalization of the island and her understanding of religious harmony among the
Buddhists, the Shintoists and the Catholics in the municipality. In the proceeding
symposiums in three municipalities, professional musicians literally started playing
music as the opening act. Instead of trying to get the attention of the residents with
musical performance or instead of making the audience feel as if they were in dialogic
interaction with the panel members, the Narae symposium started with their least
favorable format, a one-way speech. However, such a diversion was not surprising for my informants who lived in this municipality. In the symposium flyer, the mayor’s opening address was listed, and it was rather seen as a typical contextual component among the locals when the mayor decided to give a talk in a meeting. Moreover, other than the prefectural officials, the majority in the audience had not attended the symposia in other municipalities. Therefore, even though this symposium was not in keeping with the format of the prefectural organizers, local residents perceived the mayor’s speech as one of several typical components of local government venues. In some sense, the symposium format was slightly modified to accommodate the local political context rather than to accommodate possible participation from the floor.

Even though the symposium started somewhat differently from the standard prefectural format, it still moved on to the one of the core symposium components, the keynote lecture. Using PowerPoint slides, Professor Koden lectured, approximately for one hour, on the trend of UNESCO’s World Heritage meetings, his understanding of the cultural significance of the Catholic churches in the municipality, and the importance of civic-public cooperation for nomination and heritage management. Instead of having a lecture in the dialogic format, Koden’s keynote speech was strictly his lecture. While it would be the first time for some residents to hear Professor Koden’s lecture, this lecture was placed as a part of continuing study session for some municipal officials. Prior to the symposium, the mayor was enrolling Professor Koden’s online course, and made the division chiefs of the municipal halls to attend her study session on the World Heritage program, using Koden’s material from the Network University. Approximately fifteen municipal workers attended post-work study sessions between February 13 and 15, 2008
at municipal hall. For these municipal officials, including the mayor, the keynote lecture was a part of their study session and an opportunity to meet their instructor in person. Keeping with the general symposium format of the prefecture, the municipal administration slightly (or significantly) modified the venue for their interest.

When the symposium emcee announced a fifteen minutes intermission after the lecture, it was still not quite apparent if there would be any room for public participation in this symposium. The emcee or the keynote speaker did not take any questions from the floor or elicit any reaction from the audience. One major difference of this symposium from those in different municipalities was that it seemed as if the audience was using the musical performance period as their bathroom/cigarette intermission period. Instead of bringing musical performance at the beginning of the symposium, the organizers scheduled the fifteen minutes performance of the local amateur choir right after the symposium intermission. While the choir was performing on stage, the audience was relatively vacant. By the end of the choir performance, it was 3:15 in the afternoon already the meeting had gone on for one hour and 45 minutes.

**Dialogic Discussion**

The emcee then announced that the symposium was back in session, and introduced the core main of the panel discussion. The emcee stated:

[We] would like ask the discussants to talk about the followings: What do we have to do to officially make the “Churches and the Christian Sites” be World Heritage?; How should we protect and preserve the World Heritage
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72 The officials had to watch a one-hour long video lecture by Professor Koden explaining the standards of cultural landscape (February 13, 2008), the World Heritage properties in Japan (February 14, 2008), and the history of UNESCO’s World Heritage Program (February 15, 2008). The main content of the study session was to watch the video lectures. The mayor did not assign any handouts or extra readings to the officials, and the officials did not provide any discussion following each video lecture. Instead, since they had to dim the room to show the video lecture, some officials slept during the study session (author’s observation between February 13 and 15, 2008).
properties?; and How can we use the World Heritage for *machi-zukuri* (resident-oriented community development projects)? [author’s observation on February 17, 2008]

If the prefectural officials had already arranged community participation when they sent their proposal to the national government, these questions should have already been discussed among the local stakeholders. While the term *machi-zukuri* (まちづくり) legally indicates a resident-oriented community development project (see Kadomatsu 2007), the emcee for the prefectural administrators asked this question to the selected four individuals and moderator on the stage. The dialogue was arranged to take place on the stage among the discussants, but not among the local residents on the floor, who were legally considered the actors of this *machi-zukuri* project.

The title of the session, *discussion*, was slightly misleading that the moderator did not only lead the direction, but also each discussant engaged in dialogue mainly with the moderator rather than with the other discussants or audience. The selected discussants on the stage also reflected the main intention of this symposium. The moderator, who had his table and chair at the left hand side of the stage, was the president of the local think tank for the prefectural government. Another of the four discussants was frequently a keynote speaker for prefectural symposia, the other three discussants were the members of: government, the local Catholic diocese, or a pro-World Heritage organization. The discussants in the Narae symposium were the keynote speaker, the mayor, a board
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73 With the exception of the symposium in Nagasaki city (held on March 25, 2008), the composition of a standard panel was as follows: keynote speaker(s), the mayor of a local municipality, and a chief official of the World Heritage project in the prefectural government. A forth discussant would either be a representative from the local Catholic church (in Narae and Minami-Shimabara) or a member of a pro-World Heritage local organization (Sasebo and Hirado). As for the Nagasaki City symposium (held on March 25, 2008 at the Old Oura Catholic Church), the prefectural government slightly changed the discussant arrangement; the chair of the prefectural World Heritage Committee (Kazuma Hayashi), an actress and a member of the national World Heritage Committee (Tomoko Hoshino), the former news anchor of the national television network (Hisanori Isomura), and the archbishop of the Nagasaki Catholic archdiocese (Mitsuaki Takami).
member of a local Catholic parish (who were later elected as a member of the municipal legislature on February 8, 2009), and the chief official of the World Heritage project in the prefectural government. The moderator led each discussant by asking them general questions, especially so for the mayor, the local Catholic board member, and the prefectural official. Practically, the moderator advised the prefectural official to explain the general process and the tentative schedule for the official nomination to UNESCO. The mayor was asked to explain their specific administrative plan in her municipality for the nomination, and the local Catholic board member, who also was a former president of the local tourism bureau, was asked to explain his observation about the church-centered World Heritage tourism in the municipality. Instead of having a discussion, each interaction between the moderator and each discussant was framed within one or a few messages. Therefore, instead of having one presenter explain the entire project, they divided their arguments into pieces and reorganized them in a dialogic presentation style. The semi-scripted conversations were contained onstage. The audience observed the interaction, and perhaps received or guessed the organizers' message. The direction of communication between the organizers and the audience was less dialogic, but proceeded in a one-way direction from the stage to the floor. This panel “discussion” continued for approximately 45 minutes, after which point the moderator finally asked the audience if there were any questions to the discussants. At that point, it was already 4:00 in the afternoon, which happened to be the time that the symposium was scheduled to end. The moderator managed to declare an extra ten minutes to take questions from the floor. Within ten minutes, two individuals were able to ask the discussants questions (more than two people raised their hands on the floor), but one of them was a municipal
government official. Given the fact that sixty local officials were ordered to attend this symposium, the symposium organizers even made the Q&A session seem less of form for community participation.

*Communication, Procedure, Frustration*

Recent anthropological work have discussed issues of *how* to translate written documents, rules, or procedures into a specific local context at the level of practice and vice-versa (e.g. Merry 2006; Phillips 1998; Riles 1998; 2000; 2006). What was happening with the World Heritage nomination project in Nagasaki corresponded with issues of translation that anthropologists have critically analyzed with respect to the translation of policy into practice, or the interpretation of rule into procedure. Nagasaki officials interpreted the national and international rules and expectations, and designed the formats and procedures which they thought met with reviewers’ expectations. Yet, the question is how the officials interpreted national and international expectations and how they designed such community meetings. In other words, how did officials in Nagasaki attempt to clarify the vagueness (Brenneis 2006) or to fill the openness (Hart 1976) in a *clean* text (Riles 1998: 389)? During the World Heritage nomination process in Nagasaki, rather than asking the question of how to elicit opinions from local communities or residents, prefectural officials seemed more concerned with how to properly perform event so as to be seen as caring about public opinion (e.g. Phillips 1998; Richland 2008). Yet, their concern was more related to performing for national or international audiences rather than to local audiences, who were actually the local
residents. In this sense, the public symposia in Nagasaki can be examined as political rituals rather than as ideal venues for public participation.

By examining the legal behavior of the trial court judges in Arizona, Susan Philips (1998) discusses how the judges create a shared interpretation of law and due process and how they practice their interpretation in the judicial sphere. However, Philips’ insights on the construction of an “interpretive community” (Mertz 2001: 112) and the procedural orientation are not specific characteristics of the judicial spheres. As to how the prefectural administrators attempted to organize the World Heritage symposium in Narae city, such characteristics are also observable in the executive sphere, especially in the process of administrative policy planning. Specifically, in the case of Nagasaki (and Japan in general), the residents perceived the officials’ interest as adding to the lists of required activities to their administrative record to show how many occasions they provided for the residents to discuss the project. After the symposium, my informants expressed their concerns on the direction of the World Heritage nomination primary talking about the procedural aspect of the government hosted venues.

The common opinion among the informants on such governmental venues was their cynicism about the officials’ true intention. Specifically they doubted whether the officials held such symposia because they really wanted to have an opportunity to communicate with the local residents (rather than to satisfy bureaucratic interests). For example, Keigo, a local newspaper editor, did not think the officials were spending their effort to explain their project to the residents. Keigo stated;

I think the officials and the university professors need to present their project or opinions in the way that lay individuals can understand. It probably requires way more energy and time for us to understand the things which the officials and the professors can immediately understand. The officials need to
format their content for their audience (local residents). Otherwise, [we or the residents] just cannot understand what the [World Heritage] project is.  
[conversation with author, April 2, 2008]

Keigo questioned whether or not the officials attempted to communicate with the residents when they host any meetings on governmental projects.

On the question of effective communication, another informant, Juri, provided her interesting insight showing a little bit of criticism to the male residents in the island. While I was talking with Juri and two other local female informants on the World Heritage nomination, I started talking about my difficulties interviewing the local male informants. Quite often (or almost all the time) while I was conducting my fieldwork, I gained a significant amount of information when I went to social drinking functions. Most of such drinking functions which I attended in Narae (except two) are male-only functions, and the male islanders became drunk and passionately expressed their opinion about a variety of things such as community politics, church politics, local politics, and even the World Heritage nomination. However, when I interviewed the same men when sober, many of them were highly cautious and trying to avoid expressing any opinions that might conflict with other community members. When I told this to my female informants (including Juri), they burst into laughter and said;

The guys on this island are cowards! They can’t say anything without alcohol! … Obviously, it is just impossible for them to say anything in a huge hall, like the [Narae] Cultural Hall. It was just too many people in the auditorium.  
[conversation with author, April 5, 2008]  

Even without any alcohol, it still did not seem comfortable for some of the residents to ask questions or state personal opinions in front of a large number of people. In this sense, even if the organizers had allocated more time on the Q&A session, the effectiveness of
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74 While it quite often required alcohol to talk with the male informants in Narae, all of my female informants were sober when I talked with them.
the symposium in terms of government-public communication would be still in question.

Another female informant, Hiromi, also seemed to be irritated with the symposium setting:

> The television cameras were everywhere in the auditorium. I tried to not to be in their frame, but one of them stood between me and the stage and shot me for a while. I didn’t know how they would edit it and use it. I’m not supporting this project, nor opposing this project. However, when I saw myself on TV, they edited as if I was a forefront supporter of the World Heritage nomination. [conversation with author, April 1, 2008]

Hiromi’s comment reflects the double-edged nature of information disclosure. In terms of providing the information on governmental projects to the wider public in the municipality or the prefecture, it would be effective to record the events and broadcast it over the local community network channels or local news channels. At the same time, the residents, including Hiromi, quite often would not have control over how and where the video would be broadcast. In Hiromi’s case, the regional television station used the clip and broadcast it on a prefectural wide program. While the officials can use the video or audio tapes as records of the events, it could paralyze the possibilities of communication between the officials and the residents.

What is common among the comments made by informants is their demand to have a better opportunity to communicate with the officials on the World Heritage nomination project. They agreed that the symposia or public meetings were important. However, they seemed to perceive such venues as a justification for officials’ administrative actions rather than actual community participation. Hiromi stated,

> We didn’t know when the symposium would end. My friends and I could not miss the final boat to go back to our island. The Q&A didn’t start until 4PM! And, I heard that they had a surprise guest after that, right? I don’t know what they [the symposium organizers] were thinking. [conversation with author, April 1, 2008]
On the symposium flyer, the organizers did not indicate the ending time of the event, but they listed the opening time. However, it was quite critical for the residents from other islands to know the meeting schedule. Omission of information such as this was met with cynicism by some. Juri recalled a similar symposium which the prefecture hosted before the six municipalities of the southern Narae archipelago merged to form current administrative unit, the City of Narae in August 2004.

> You know, when this municipality got merged, they also hosted a similar symposium. My neighbors and I heard about the symposium after it was done. Are the officials planning such events just to have some proof for themselves?” [conversation with author, April 5, 2008]

Including Keigo, my informants expressed frustration that the message was primarily sent from the individuals on the stage. It was not communication, but it was rather that the government organized a venue to provide a one-way message flow to the residents. With the investment the government officials had made, such as allocating their budget, arranging the keynote speaker and the discussants, organizing a study group at the municipal hall, and arranging municipal officials to attend the symposium to make up part of their audience, the officials essentially organized this symposium as a staged venue. They crafted a venue in which residents formed a pure audience, not a body actively interacting with officials. It was organized as if it were an administrative ritual which was prepared and scripted in terms of the administrative common sense. While the national documents implied that the locals supported making Catholic churches in Nagasaki the national tentative World Heritage site, the actual social context in Nagasaki was not even at the stage in which it could be called a community participant project. Rather, government officials were still struggling to advertise what they wanted to do.
The interactions with my informants reminded me one of the interviews which I had with Heiko City officials back on January 11, 2008. When I was interviewing the Heiko preservation officials on the World Heritage nomination, one official, Hisao, expressed their concern on how to evaluate reasonable community participation.

It’s still not clear to us what the national and prefectural offices consider as community participation. Should we have to visit house to house and ask their consent? Or is it would be fine if we just get the consent from the community leaders (chonai kai cho: 町内会長)? It’s really not clear to us. [conversation with author, January 11, 2008]

Other municipal officials, including those from other municipalities (including several prefectural officials), also expressed the same frustration. Even though the Nagasaki Catholic churches officially became the tentative World Heritage properties in January 2007, the actual project did not seem even started at the municipal level when I interviewed them in January 2008.

However, it was not appropriate to conclude that the officials of Heiko City underestimated the actual voice of the residents in the nomination process. Rather, their frustration was related to ambiguities in the nature of government-citizen communication and relationships. Later in the summer of 2008, an anthropology professor of a local university, Sanae, who was serving as one of the cultural landscape bylaw committee for Heiko City, provided me an interesting insight.

I have known the preservation officials of Heiko for years, but I was a bit of stunned by what they do. Whenever they conduct any kind of cultural or preservation projects, they literally visit all of the houses in the project area. They inform the residents and ask them for their permission. The officials do it even when they use some landscape pictures for their municipal bulletin. They visit the houses in the frame and the owners of the farmlands in the frame to get their consent. [conversation with author, June 8, 2008]
Heiko City officials emphasized the importance of direct interpersonal communication in the governmental project. While the communication between the officials and the residents were more direct, the symposium or governmental venues were organized more in a mass communication format. The officials were trying to send their messages in a one-way format not only for those who came to the venue but also to those possibly watching the recorded television programs. The density of the communication in the latter approach tends to be much weaker than that of the former, but the national office recommends the latter and uses it in part to evaluate standards on community participation. However, when residents view such administratively recommended procedures as theatrical setup, it is questionable that such a venue could function either to stimulate or incorporate actual community participation.

Rather than highly prepared or scripted settings, the actual venue for community participation would involve improvisation both of officials and local residents. Such improvising involves unexpected questions, frequent apologies to the locals, reorganization of the argument, and reestablishment of opportunities to clarify the project’s focus. Municipal officials, including those in Heiko and Narae, shared a sense of the process of such improvising in some administrative policy making. Therefore, municipal officials personally told me that it would either require a long period of time to build community consensus for the actual World Heritage nomination, or it might not even be possible to bring the World Heritage project to the stage of actual nomination. In this sense, the symposium seemed more like an administrative ritual practice, especially when municipal officials and residents were concerned about the effective communication interaction in administrative policy making. While the prefectural
organizers put more emphasis on the procedural aspects of administrative events or on accommodating local political dynamics, they discounted the communicative aspects of community participation.

If we take as a given that procedure is paramount in bureaucratic culture, then even contextual and grassroots formats become processed through convention, collapsing them. Ironically then, so-called community participation becomes a source of residents’ frustration. What follows from this paradox is the communicative actuality of the municipal preservation specialist faced with the task of conveying information and getting consent from frustrated local residents. In the next chapter, I examine how public administrators strive to enhance communication through shared databases and sources, but are thwarted by the specialist knowledge needed to use administrative technology, particularly Geographic Information Systems [GIS].
Chapter VII: Technology of Administrative (Mis)Communication

In this chapter, by ethnographically examining the use of digital cartography in Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, I analyze what municipal officials consider as tools for rational governance. Digital cartography, especially geographic information systems [GIS], has lately been getting more attention among public administrators as an ideal tool for effective governance. Officials can not only store census data, income information, crime rates, medical and other statistics in a GIS program, but they can also numerically and visually process it for policy-making purposes. With its multiple functionalities, such as digital coding capabilities, database functions, data-sharing functions, and visualization capabilities of coded spatial data, GIS is often critically seen as the embodiment of Foucault’s sense of rational governance and is often referred to as a tool for governmental power. As a visualized format, however, non-GIS-processed maps can also inspire policy-makers’ imaginations and can facilitate policy discussions. Maps can be viewed as communication tools to circulate and exchange data and ideas, not only between public administrators, but also between officials and citizens. In this sense, the primary interest of government officials lies in the communicative effectiveness of cartography rather than in the technical advantages of GIS programs. I became aware of the communicative importance attached to technological means when I received a phone call from one of my key informants in the municipal government of Narae.
A Phone Call

In early October 2007, a couple weeks after my wife and I were settled in our apartment on Nagasaki’s Narae island, I received a phone call from Hiroshi, a preservation specialist of a local municipality. On the phone, he seemed slightly troubled and panicked. Ever since the Japanese national government had included three of the Catholic churches in this municipality on the national tentative World Heritage List in January 2007, Hiroshi seemed to be slightly more tired than before. Serving as the only preservation specialist of the municipality, Hiroshi had to deal with multiple administrative responsibilities such as conducting archaeological surveys, managing heritage properties, and coordinating community outreach education programs. When I met him right after arriving on the island, he seemed burdened by the stress of such multiple governmental responsibilities. Even so, Hiroshi had patiently and generously helped my research, so when Hiroshi made a request of me, I could not turn it down.

Hiroshi carefully stated “Yamada-san. Can I… Can I ask you a favor? If I’m right, I thought that you said that you were familiar with cartography, right? Is it possible to ask you to make a map?” (conversation with author, October 26, 2007) When he said the word “map,” I immediately felt a bit wary. I responded to his request with an ambiguous utterance, “Yeah, hum.” The combination of such terms as cartography, maps, and public administration bring to my mind Foucauldian critiques on governmental rationale, Bruno Latour’s analysis on technology and society, and heated debates among critical GIS (geographic information systems) scholars. As critical anthropologists and critical geographers have for more than a decade debated the relationship between technology
and power, I thus wondered what it would mean to provide my technical skill to the government officials.

At that moment, I was quite surprised with myself that the word map made me so cautious, even though Hiroshi had not yet mentioned what kind of map he wanted me to make. Hiroshi continued, “As you know, one of the national officials recently visited here for World Heritage-related appraisal, right? Anyhow, he was here to see the condition of the landscape and the churches. He just contacted me and asked me if there was any map which outlined all of the land use regulations of the island of Kuga, one of the islands in this archipelago. Is it possible to ask you to make a map for us?”

(conversation with author, October 26, 2007) It sounded like multiple officials wanted a map by which they could find out the spatial arrangements land use regulations. They wanted legal information in a handy format. With the map, which could represent the spatial arrangement of laws, the officials would discuss the possible directions of the World Heritage project. Therefore, what providing my GIS skills would mean, I imagined, was providing the technology to practice a Foucauldian sense of rational governance (e.g. Blackburn 2005; Burchell et al. 1991; Foucault 1979; Merry 2001; Rose-Redwood 2006). Though I wondered about the possible ethical ramifications if I responded “yes” to Hiroshi, I knew that it would be difficult to say no. If I said no, it would be difficult to continue my fieldwork. If I said yes, my GIS skill would be a part of governmental disciplinary power.

However, at the same time, I wondered why Hiroshi was asking me to make a map. Why was a public official asking a new resident of their island for technical help? He knew I moved to the island to conduct my dissertation fieldwork. He knew I was not
going to stay there for more than a year. It did not seem to be an effective and rational governance strategy to assign such a highly technical task to an anthropology graduate student.

I consequently thought that his request was somewhat removed from Foucault’s analysis of governmentality. If public officials were effectively using a technology – GIS in this case – to rationally govern their citizens, they should not be asking a new islander to provide his technical skills to fulfill their governmental obligation. Rather, the government should have technical specialists within their institution. When I thought about it in this way, answering Hiroshi’s request was no longer a dilemma. It was the opportunity to see how the municipal officials were (or were not) using technologies, how they were using technologies to visualize law, and how they communicated (and mis-communicated) with their citizens and other officials through their use of technologies. After some awkward starts and pauses, I said yes to Hiroshi’s request.

Digital cartography, especially geographic information systems (GIS), has been seen as an effective tool for policy-making in a variety of fields including public administration, community cooperatives, business strategies, or even medical practices (e.g. Bell 2004; Corbett 2005; Craig 2002; Elwood 2008; Obermeyer 1998). Spatial analysis is essential before making a place a World Heritage property. Maps enable policy-makers to see the spatial distribution of land use regulations and of legally unregulated spots called White Areas (hakushoku chiiki: 白色地域) (e.g. Kadomatsu 2007; McDonald 1997). Before officially nominating a space as a World Heritage property, the Japanese national government mandates the elimination of unregulated
White Areas from the prospective World Heritage zone. In other words, officials have to
draft and implement some form of land use regulations over any White Areas.

For Hiroshi and the national officials, the map of the land use regulation would be
the tool to analyze the possible options to articulate the local legal context and their
interpretation of the World Heritage Convention. The map would be the tool to
effectively translate the World Heritage Convention within the Japanese legal system.
Ultimately, the map would function to establish Latour’s sense of networks among
UNESCO, the public officials, and the local residents (e.g. Coles 2004; Latour 1999;
Latour and Woolgar 1986). Therefore, rather than just using GIS as a tool for my
research, I would examine the use of GIS in a context of administrative communication.
More specifically, I could also analyze how officials used GIS, and how they
communicate with one another by using data processed through GIS.

As put forth by scholars in social sciences who examine contexts of scientific
procedures and outcomes (e.g. Callon 1998; Callon et al. 1986; Coles 2004; Latour 1999;
Latour and Woolgar 1986; Rapp 1999), the analysis of the context behind map
processing reveals critical insights into knowledge production. A map is often considered
a pure representation of social and natural facts. Going though multiple scientific
processes such as the mathematical measurements of both natural and social conditions,
the spatial representation of a map is often seen as a legitimate factual representation.
What the term “science” provides to the map is the certification of legitimacy.

GIS, the abbreviation for Geographic Information Science (or GIScience), is
understood as a tool that can produce information and knowledge through technology.
Furthermore, it requires time and investment to acquire the skills and techniques to use
this digital cartography. GIS programmers also need to be familiar with related computer programming, statistics, and data sources. Therefore, a map is more than just a tool. It is a representation of knowledge and it is a representation of power (e.g. Armstrong 2005; Chrisman 2005; Crampton 2004; Goss 1995; Harris 1996; Openshaw 1991; Pickles 1995; Warren 2004; Wright 1997). While those who have access to GIS training and information can enjoy the benefits and place themselves in advantaged networks through such a “tool,” those who do not have access are placed in a disadvantaged position, literally outside the network of policy translation. By virtue of the fact that Hiroshi, a municipal official, was asking me for technical help, I felt that there was something strange about their manner of governance. I wondered if even the public officials of the island (also the residents) were really in the geo-knowledge network.

*Copying and Scanning*

Right after I agreed to Hiroshi’s request, he started explaining the details to me. What Hiroshi wanted me to present in the map was the overlay of the following land use regulations of the island: agricultural land (*nou yo chi*: 農用地) and agricultural promotion regions (*nogyo shinko chiiki*: 農業振興地域), forest reservations (*hoan rin*: 保安林), and the national parks (*kokuritsu koen chiiki*: 国立公園地域). He told me that he would look for copies of each land use regulation maps, and would give them to me. As soon as Hiroshi told me this, I immediately responded:
Toru Yamada: Do you have them [the maps] in digital format? I mean either in shapefile format, XML format, Illustrator, or CAD? 

Hiroshi: Uh... I don't know, but I can look for paper copies.

TY: It would be ideal if you could give them to me in some sort of digital format because I will have to process all the data in my computer. If you don't have them in digital format, is it possible to ask you to scan the paper maps, instead? Then, I can manually trace them using my computer cartography program. Any picture formats would work, JPG, GIF, TIFF...

Hiroshi: Oh, I can scan the paper maps for you. Would that be OK?

TY: Sure.

[conversation with author, October 26, 2007]

What I decided to do was to manually trace (digitize or geo-code) the copied maps in my computer. It requires some patience to engage in map digitization or geo-coding, tracing and clicking scanned maps with a computer mouse or touch-pad. Scanned maps are placed in a GIS application, and manually modified by adding coordinate values. This process is called geo-referencing. After this geo-referencing process, GIS programmers extract the information from the scanned maps – digitizing or geo-coding – by tracing the lines, dots, or passes in the maps. In terms of the technical aspects, this digitization process is not much different from paper tracing. It requires delicate and careful tracing. However, unlike the former, geo-coding coordinated values are added with each movements and click of the mouse (e.g. Cox 2004; Gilliland-Swetland 1991; Heald 1996). Digitization and geo-coding are processes of converting paper map information into numeric values, and putting them into a preferable format for scientific spatial analysis.

Even though this island municipality is considered to be on the periphery of Japanese geo-politics, I doubted that it was necessary to manually convert everything.

75 Shapefile format contains graphic information with coordinated data (longitude/latitude information), and is primarily used in ESRI's ArcGIS programs. The data in the Extensible Markup Language [XML] format is easily convertible for several major GIS platforms.
With such doubts in mind, after the telephone conversation with Hiroshi, I visited his office to see the maps of land use regulations to get a sense of how much time I would need if I had to manually digitize them. In his office, Hiroshi showed me a neatly and digitally processed map of the Saikai National Park (Saikai Kokuritsu Koen: 西海国立公園), of which a large portion of the land mass of the municipality was a part. The legend of the map indicated that the map was made by the Fuji Micro Corporation and distributed by the Nature & Parks of the National Ministry of the Environment (環境省自然環境局) in March 2002. I wondered if Hiroshi knew whether or not he could acquire the original digital version of the map. The mapping corporation was located in Kumamoto prefecture and the National Ministry was in Tokyo; neither of the institutes had frequent contact with Hiroshi or with his administrative division. I started realizing that manual digitizing was the most likely option, and silently began estimating how many days I would need to process it. Kuga island was approximately three square miles (five square kilometers), and I only had to process three kinds of land use regulations.

While I was thinking that two weeks would be enough to make the map, Hiroshi frantically said:

Hiroshi: I guess we are really in big trouble.
TY: Trouble?
Hiroshi: I don’t know. The national office suggested we consider designing a preservation policy in such a way as to protect the landscape of the entire island. I don’t know what to do, or how to do it.
[conversation with author, October 26, 2007]

Hiroshi’s anxious statement clarified to me as to how the map would be used. They were asking me to make a map so that they could see the spatial distribution of land use regulations on Hisaka island. It also meant that this map would simultaneously display
where the legally unregulated spots – the White Areas – were. My map would function to provide such spatial information for the policy-makers to draft a prospective preservation policy. However, it still seemed strange to ask a resident – especially a new resident – to engage in such a highly administrative decision-making process.

Administrative Archaeologists in the Government

The clue to Hiroshi’s request was in the layout of the city hall which well represented the administrative structure of Japanese municipalities. This was the office of the board of education, and Hiroshi was serving as the preservation specialist in the lifelong learning division of the office. He had a desk in the office of the education board, located on the third level of the city hall annex. Typical of a Japanese work space, there were no partitions between the desks, and the officials’ desks were all exposed to others as well as to visitors. Five to six desks were placed together to form one division area (seven to eight divisions in total), and Hiroshi’s desk and his division were located at the far end of the room. This was the office of the local board of education. There were brochures and flyers of sports events, music concerts, craft lessons, and information of financial support for students who were planning to go to high school. However, there was no map posted on the wall of the office. Hiroshi’s primary obligation was historic preservation, managing historic artifacts, architecture, and historic sites. His main purpose for using maps, therefore, was to plot the location of such historic materials in the municipality. The preservation specialist’s primary responsibility had been historic preservation, and not reviewing the legal condition of land use regulations.
Municipalities hired archaeologists primarily as technicians (Takahashi 2010) or curators. One of the curators of another municipality of the Santo archipelago, later told me his experience as a preservation official when I interviewed him (Conversation with author, December 28, 2007). According to Yoshi, the curator of Shonega Town, municipalities around Japan started allocating a budget for archaeological surveys in the 1970s. Japan was in the period of post-WWII economic boom, and the national administration implemented the nation-wide urban/economic development policy (shin zenkoku zogo kaihatsu keikaku: 新全国総合開発計画) in 1969. However, under the National Act on Protection of Cultural Properties of 1950, if it was considered that the proposed development area contained some archaeological remains, the developer and the regional administration would have to discuss whether to continue the development project or to preserve the remains.76 Practically, it became mandatory for the prefectures and the municipalities to hire archaeologists if the officials wanted to follow the national development policies (e.g. Barnes 1990; Fawcett 1990; 1995). Finishing his undergraduate degree in archaeology in such a changing socio-political atmosphere, Yoshi got a job offer from an island municipality in Nagasaki, Shonega Town, as a curator with a primary work assignment in archaeological survey. In fact, the municipal curators and preservation specialists around Nagasaki mainly had their undergraduate training in archaeology (for example, all of the three municipal preservation officials in Santo archipelago were trained as archaeologists).

Their primary responsibilities were to survey and preserve historic heritage and to engage in community lifelong education. In such an administrative environment, it was

76 The National Act on Protection of Cultural Properties (Law No. 267, 1950), sec 57.
not part of their primary responsibilities to engage in analyzing the legal nature of land use regulations or the technical aspects of GIS application or GIS-related data formats. Until the national officials visited the archipelago, land use regulations were far from their administrative responsibilities. For instance, when I visited Hiroshi to see the map of Saikai National Park, he was making phone calls to multiple divisions in the city hall to ask for copies of land use regulation maps. Therefore, what the national official asked Hiroshi seemed slightly out of Hiroshi’s realm of understanding. On top of this, I was asking him for digital copies. It was clear that there was a sizable degree of miscommunication between the national officials, Hiroshi, and myself. Yet, it seemed that the digitized map would integrate the information of different human actors, and could function as an inanimate agent by providing some networks to the human actors including the national official, Hiroshi, and myself.

![Figure 14: Visual layers of Japan’s zoning regulations using GIS software (made by Toru Yamada).]
The Place of GIS, the Function of Maps

However, I still felt strange about the fact that Hiroshi asked me to make a map. GIS has been praised and criticized at the same time. For example, while the possible administrative efficiency with the use of GIS applications are seen as positive by the Japanese national government (e.g. Basic Act on Promotion of Utilization of Geographical Information: 地理空間情報活用推進基本法), critical scholars have been cautious about the use of GIS to possibly increase the efficiency of governmental surveillance (e.g. Armstrong 2005; Goss 1995). GIS can be seen as an effective tool for in Foucauldian sense of rational governance (e.g. Rose-Redwood 2006). In GIS platforms, multiple data can be stored, and can be easily edited and visualized (Figure 20). It can cut costs as it makes the order of purpose-based maps unnecessary, and can save associated labor costs. Even though GIS can serve as an ultimate tool for rational governance, Hiroshi did not find much incentive to use the cartographic application in his administrative environment. As a municipal archaeological surveyor and a lifelong education coordinator, it was more rational for him to have some computer software with which he could effectively present his administrative tasks to other officials and residents in the municipality. Hiroshi wanted an overlaid map of multiple land use regulations. The coordinate value in the digital map was not his primary concern. What he wanted was the print-out of a visual product. Such complicated intermediary processes as map distortion, geo-referencing, or geo-coding, or such functional aspects of GIS as its database function and editing functions were not important factors for Hiroshi. What was more important for him was the visual representation of the map, and the conventional/communicative effect of the map to the national official.
The subtle emphasis on the communicative effect of maps was made clearer when I met Yukio, one of the municipal preservation officials of the city of Heiko in Nagasaki. When I interviewed Yukio, he expressed his opinion on the use of digital cartography in their preservation project. Yukio was not an archaeologist but a regular administrative official. Thus, he did not fit into the standard criteria of a municipal preservation officers. More precisely, Heiko city took a nonstandard direction on heritage preservation. After the national government selected the Catholic churches in Nagasaki as the prospective World Heritage properties in January 2007, Heiko city reorganized the heritage administration from the 2007/2008 fiscal calendar year. The municipal administration moved their heritage preservation division out of the local board of education, and it made it an independent administrative department. During the process of this administrative reform, Yukio, with his experience in municipal administration and his skills in computer programming, was transferred from other departments to the new department of heritage preservation.

When I went over to Yukio’s office, he and his colleagues told me that they were in the brainstorming stage on what the ideal mapping programs would be for the project and who would be the ideal committee members to continue this World Heritage project. Since I was already helping Hiroshi, Yukio and his colleagues already knew about my involvement in their project. The focus of our conversation gradually turned to that of map programs. More precisely, when I was asking questions of one of his colleagues, Hisao, about the project, Yukio was doodling dots and lines on a blank A4 sized paper. The dots and lines looked as if they were drawn in one of the most popular GIS programs. I asked Yukio:
TY: Do you use GIS?
Yukio: Uh… I don’t, but I’m a bit familiar with GIS. I’m more familiar with Adobe Illustrator.
Hisao: What is that (looking at Yukio’s doodling)?
TY: When you digitize a curve in a GIS program, that’s how the data is processed in the program. If it’s zoomed out, it looks like a curve. But the actuality is a combination of dots and lines.
Yukio: Yeah. This is why I’m a bit reluctant to use GIS for this project. It does not seem really visually appealing to the audience. I think Illustrator is more ideal for us, even though Illustrator is not capable of storing coordinate values. I can still make visually appealing maps with Illustrator.
[conversation with author, January 11, 2008]

As Yukio pointed out, the primary purpose of making and using maps in their project was to effectively communicate with other administrative staff and the local resident on their preservation project. Yukio and his colleague were expecting the map to help establish a communication network among local residents and public officials. Hiroshi was less interested in the possible data-storing functions or in the coordinates, which are the main functions of GIS programs. The “accurate” or “precise” coordinate values were less important. For Hiroshi, Yukio and their colleagues, GIS was not fully a tool for rational governance. Their sense of rational governance was more about the effectiveness of interpersonal communication. If it would take too much time to acquire the skills to use computer programming such as GIS, they expressed that it was not ideal to use such programs.

Communicating over a Map: Converted GIS Map

After loading three kinds of zoning maps (agricultural land and agricultural promotion zones, forest reservations zones, and the national parks) from Hiroshi to my memory stick, I went back to my apartment and started processing the maps. Setting a
digital municipal map as its base, I overlaid the scanned zoning maps and traced the land
use regulation data. However, when I finished processing the data on my GIS program, I
faced a problem which I had predicted before I started processing the data. It was a
critical but simple problem. Neither Hiroshi nor any other officials in the municipal
board of education had GIS software. I had to convert the data into some compatible
format for Hiroshi’s computer. Through this conversion process (from GIS format to pdf
format), the coordinate values in the GIS platform would be lost. Since the converted
format did not contain the coordinate values, there would be no calculating function in
the pdf map on each legally regulated zone or for each overlapping regulated zone.
Practically, the converted map was simply a visual representation of the land use
regulations in the island, and the original database function was lost from the map in the
file conversion process. In other words, a significant amount of the rational technical
function of GIS disappeared in the conversion process. This converted map diminishes
the technological governing ability. I literally neutered the critical rational aspects off the
GIS spatial data. Other than the visual representation of the pdf format, the data which I
processed did not go outside the computer. It did not seem as if a technical rational
network was going to be established among the officials.

Other than the technical rationales, this pdf converted map still carried its
function in the administrative system. This map helped the officials to communicate with
one another to brainstorm their plans and strategies for the World Heritage nomination
project. The officials discussed their World Heritage project using the map which visual
represented the distributions of the land use regulations in the island. The map visually
indicated where the legally regulated areas and where the unregulated areas were.
Therefore, the map helped the officials to discuss the possible drafting process of a new landscape preservation policy, and possible strategies to work with the local residents for the nomination. For instance, Hiroshi asked the national official for their advice on the preservation project using this pdf map (later the prefectural officials joined in this interaction). Using the pdf map, the officials communicated with one another and brainstormed their plans. This was precisely what Hiroshi explained to me when he asked me to make the map: he wanted the map, which outlines all of the land use regulations of the island of Kuga. He needed the visual function of the map. The pdf converted map had enough functions for him to communicate with other officials. In other words, the map functioned to establish the interpersonal and conceptual networks among government officials.

Communicating over a Map: Presenting it to the Residents

While Hiroshi’s primary interest in the function of the map was to see/show the distributions of the land use regulations, Heiko City’s Yukio designed a map with a different purpose. Instead, Yukio designed a map to inform other officials and residents in the municipality of the tentative idea of their landscape preservation project and the reason why they were interested in preserving them. Unlike Hiroshi’s map, Yukio’s did not outline any existing land use regulations. Instead, using the administrative map as its base, Yukio overlaid the projected zone of cultural landscape preservation area, landscape components, a description of the concept, and the district names. By so doing, the map was designed to give a general outline of the World Heritage project in the municipality.
Therefore, this map did not have to indicate the precise geographical grid. It was still ideal to be precise, but this was not a finalized legal map. The map was rather meant to effectively send the concept of projected landscape preservation to the local residents. Therefore, for Yukio and his colleagues, the basic component of GIS – the coordinate values – was not the important component of their cartographic activities. For them, it was much more important to include pictures of a local landscape to explain how it would fit in national evaluation categories. The municipal officials used computer graphic software and explained the interpretation and the meaning of each landscape component.

GIS did not necessarily embody rational governance in this context. While Heiko officials emphasized the importance of the communicative aspect of the map, GIS would not necessarily help the officials communicate with residents. The officials needed more visually-appealing presentation materials, not only administrative cartographic tools. Rather than the cartographic software, officials preferred graphic and presentation software, such as Adobe Illustrator and Microsoft PowerPoint. The map, in the other words, is just a tool to communicate with the local residents. It would provide the geographic overview of their preservation project and the spatial distribution of the landscape components. However, the map functioned as a reference to corresponding landscape photography. Each landscape picture was indexed with the district name corresponding to the map’s district index on the map. Yukio and his colleagues organized PowerPoint slides to show how each landscape components in various districts form an integrated cultural landscape under one cultural theme. Instead of outlining or explaining the details of each land use regulation, such as agricultural regulations, forest acts, or
national park regulations, Heiko officials stuck to explaining the holistic picture of the projected landscape preservation (World Heritage preservation project). Therefore, even though GIS could serve the administrative purpose of effectively communicating with local residents, the program was not ideal for communication across administrative divisions.

**GIS: Rational Administrative Tool?**

However, GIS is generally considered an effective administrative tool. As Foucault argues in his theory of ‘disciplinary power,’ it is crucial for modern government to be able to effectively manage a population and its geographical knowledge (e.g. Foucault 1979; 1995; Ó Tuathail 1996). By combining statistics and cartographic functions, GIS is often considered a tool that represents a Foucauldian sense of ‘disciplinary power.’ In a digitally-inscribed or geo-coded environment with such as coordinate values, zip codes, and street addresses, officials can manage a variety of data such as census, household income rates, household characteristics, political affiliations, racial/ethnic data, or crime rates. Officials can visualize data which they need for administrative assignments (e.g. collecting taxes, allocating police surveillance, drafting zoning regulations, or even re-drawing voting districts) (Armstrong 2005; Crampton 2004; Harris 1996; Ó Tuathail 1996; Openshaw 1991; Rose-Redwood 2006). Furthermore, by setting up a shared database and having the same information, officials not only in different administrative divisions, but also in different administrative jurisdictions (municipal, prefectural, or national), can communicate with one another on their administrative projects through GIS. Therefore, GIS has been seen as a positive and
ideal application for rational and neoliberal governance on one hand, and also as an application for ‘disciplinary power.’

In other words, through the GIS application, computer network systems, and shared GIS databases, both advocates and critical scholars posit it as a platform which enables officials to more effectively communicate with one another. By placing GIS in the position of an intermediary agency, officials establish actor networks on policy discussion. However, this premise often misses critical human and administrative factors. This actor network depends largely on how much the involved human actors are familiar with GIS systems, computer network systems, and database systems. Yet, more importantly, can each administrative office allocate enough of the budget to buy the GIS systems and hire technicians, or would they even find any interest in allocating their budget to GIS system development?

As for the municipalities which I conducted my fieldwork in, the officials seemed less interested in using GIS applications. To use GIS for policy planning purposes, the local public administration either has to create an independent GIS division for data processing, or allocate staff with GIS skills to each administrative unit. Otherwise, officials are neither able to input data nor extract data from GIS applications. It requires skills to effectively use such computer-mediated communication. Therefore, it was not ideal for an administrative division in a municipality to start using a GIS application. If the use of the application was regulated to one division, the processed data would only stay within that division, which would still have to pay an installation and license fee to the GIS software vendor. Furthermore, the division staff would have to print out or convert GIS data to different file formats (as I did for Hiroshi) in order to communicate
with officials from separate divisions and with local residents. In such an administrative environment, GIS does not function to build an administrative network among actors for policy making. In other words, GIS did not function as a communication tool in such environments.

**GIS: Alternative Communication Avenue**

Yet, the Japanese national administration has been taking an initiative not only to make GIS a tool for administrative management, but also to make it a tool for administrative information transparency. Since 2004, the National Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism has made the geographic data available for the public in text file [TXT] format on their website. In 2006, the National Ministry made a significant change to their GIS website by adding the downloadable data in the Extensible Markup Language [XML] format which were easily convertible to use on several major GIS platforms. Therefore, after this change, *for those who were already familiar with GIS applications*, it was no longer time-consuming to process geographic data such as land use regulations, topology, and public infrastructure on GIS programs. Public officials, engineers, developers, and legal attorneys working on land disputes, find such digital information useful. One goal of this national initiative was providing administrative transparency, and in part to encourage the public to become familiar with GIS programs. However, since it requires a relative amount of training and practice to

---

78 In 2008, the national office also changed their Geodetic System of the online data from Japan Geodetic System to World Geodetic System [WGS 84].  
79 The census data is not available from this website. Census GIS data is available on the website of the National Statistics Center at http://www.e-stat.go.jp/ accessed on February 22, 2011.  
use GIS applications, this national initiative seemed to provide a significant amount of advantage to those possessing GIS skills and techniques. The GIS technicians and the organizations with GIS technicians can communicate with one another to discuss their development projects. The advantaged population with GIS skills benefit from this national transparency project by being able to use GIS as their communication agency. The national government distributes their digital information equally to all citizens via the Internet. Yet, as if it were color-blind, this initiative was highly technology-blind, or more precisely GIS-blind (myth of open source fairness). By trying to be fair and trying to inspire the public to be familiar with GIS, the national administration ignored the existing technological discrepancy of GIS skills among the citizens. While even municipal administrations, such as Narae or Heiko, were struggling to allocate their budget to hire GIS specialists or to acquire software licenses, the national GIS data were available to the advantaged organizations including commercial corporations. GIS data is available to the public, and those with GIS skills can form an administrative GIS community and build their actor network by using the downloadable data. However, those without such GIS skills or those who are not interested in learning and using GIS, including the municipal preservation officials in Nagasaki prefectures, will be excluded from this GIS actor network. As a result, the officials cannot provide the opportunity to their citizens to be in this GIS actor network. The alternative communication avenue, the GIS actor network in this case, exists outside the citizens’ and officials' sphere as if it were an alternative virtual reality. ⁸¹

---

⁸¹ It is literally a virtual reality because this actor network has to get through via a digital world of cartography and database.
Direct Communication – Communication over an Actor Network

In this context, use of digital cartography produces two types of communications: one is the communication in which individuals use maps as a reference tool for interpersonal communication, and the other is the one in which the individuals indirectly communicate through using GIS. As Hiroshi, Yukio, and other public preservation administrators use maps, the maps function as a supplement to their interpersonal communication on administrative policy planning. Individual actors verbally communicate with each other either by phone or in person, and employ the map as a mediating force in their interpersonal dialogue. The actors in these communicative contexts are highly interested in how maps help them effectively communicate with others (other officials or citizens in this case) on their project. Effectively designing the strategy for interpersonal communication, and carefully interacting with other officials and local residents, and building of consensus for their administrative projects are highly rational approaches for municipal officials. In this communicative context, the focus of governance is how to effectively manage (or subtly govern) the interpersonal interaction rather than virtually govern the local residents with their digital census data or spatial data.

Contrary to the direct communicative aspect of map usage, the GIS-mediated actor network is indirect interpersonal communication. Actors such as the officials or the policy makers establish their actor networks or interact with one another through digitally geo-coded data. For example, national officials, regional officials, and the public, can indirectly communicate via the geo-coded cartographic data (especially after the GIS information disclosure in 2004). In such a virtual world, the information on individuals
such as income level, land use information, and property values, could circulate beyond an individual’s control. Foucault used the term ‘biopolitics’ to describe the use of technological means to gather critical information individuals (Foucault 1990). With its technological multi-functionality, GIS surely embodies the Foucauldian concept of biopolitics, and could enable more effective governmental surveillance on citizens. According to this logic, GIS is the tool to make Bentham’s panopticon a reality. However, when such digital bio-data is available as open source information as a part of an equal information access policy, it is the organizations with GIS skills which gain advantage over the public in the use of bio-data.

However, what is missing in critical GIS discussions is how policy makers extract and process such bio-data (digital data) to present them for policy discussion. For those who are more concerned with the effects of interpersonal communication such as Hiroshi and Yukio, the visual effect of the map is more important than the actual bio-power which the GIS application could possibly provide. If the map does not function to effectively direct resident’s attention and ultimately inspire them to cooperate with their administrative project, GIS is not the tool for rational governance. This is true if public administration officials cannot allocate their budget or staff for system installation. Also, if core officials, who have little training in general administrative law or tasks, are hired for specific administrative assignments, they would find few rational aspects in GIS applications for their governmental assignments. What is missing in the Foucauldian argument on GIS application is an analysis on how officials and individuals use GIS data, and more specifically how they expect to communicate with one another using digitally-processed maps.
Chapter VIII: Conclusion

In this dissertation, I argued that the words in an international convention, which we often believe will ensure democratic processes, can paradoxically restrict our lives. Playing a role at the intersection of the World Heritage Convention (convention) and local residents (contexts), government officials intervene in the flow of meaning and redirect it to their own benefit. By drawing from a relatively vague taxonomy, officials attempt to direct the public’s attention away from the central focus of their administrative projects and push their agendas forward using terms like minkan (non-governmental bodies), or chiiki (region or community). Moreover, such manipulations take place at the level of language use (rather than at a level of direct disciplinary force, for example), so stay relatively unnoticed (e.g. Arno 2009).

The officials in my ethnography had the benefit of this advantageous intermediary position, but at the same time were vulnerable because of it. They had to be acquainted not only with which legal terms and phrases corresponded to those of other legal regimes, but also with how to precisely articulate words from one to another. Such legal articulation – or administrative articulation – is highly technical and constitutes particular speech and writing patterns among public officials (or administrative manyuaru). While familiarity with such speech and writing patterns improves the communication among the officials, it also leads to a formation of a particular administrative culture, which limits the officials’ ability to communicate with those outside of this cultural sphere. Instead of being tools for effective communication, highly specialized language use, speech behavior, and technological applications interfered with the communication flows
between public officials and local residents, and ultimately jeopardized the World Heritage nomination project.

“At” the juxtaposition, Nagasaki public officials faced the “dilemma of intermediaries” (Merry 2006: 42). They were balanced between the international legal regime and local social contexts, just as the village headmen in Central Africa struggling to balance their power and vulnerability (Gluckman 1949). While the anthropological studies of juxtaposition used to focus on the dynamics between colonial powers and colonial subjects, the same sense of question can be applied even in the current tide of globalization, in which even the developed nation can be placed as a subject of an international convention.

Anthropologists have inherited the problem of cultural juxtaposition from classic colonial studies in current applications of the modern legal context. Particularly such anthropologists as Annelise Riles (1998; 2000), Sally Falk Moore (1978), and Sally Merry (2006) have been looking into the juxtaposition of international conventions and national-local social contexts. In the same vein as what is taking place in former colonies, the social contexts of developed nations like Japan have become a subject of this global-local intersection even though the two contexts are different insofar as there is no enforcement with international law.

The contribution of this study to preceding studies in anthropology is the detailed ethnographic analysis of bureaucrats’ dilemma of being at such a juxtaposition. By critically looking into how intermediary actors craft documents and control their speech, I argue that tangible maneuvers of power are based on the combination of small-scale linguistic manipulations and negotiations. The direction of power is highly context-based
and indeterminate rather than having some absolute conceptual existence. Power instead is in the hands of those who can critically and pragmatically analyze how linguistic manipulations are connected and intertwined with one another. I will provide one final ethnographic vignette to illustrate this exclusion from the sphere of these indexical connections.

_E-mail from the Field_

On January 8, 2011, I received an e-mail from Keigo, one of my closest contacts in Narae. It was the second time I had exchanged e-mail with Keigo since I left Narae at the end of July 2010, and I had several things which I wanted to tell him and talk about with him. He was the editor of a small local newspaper and was the former chief secretary of the Narae Bureau of Tourism. Since 2006, he has been issuing A3-size four-page biweekly local newspapers mainly focusing on the news of local events around the Santo region. The January 1st issue of 2011 marked the 100th issue, and he sent me this special issue as a PDF attachment. Along with my work at the Narae municipal government, the frequent interactions with Keigo gave me valuable insight into how local residents perceived the progress with Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination. Our e-mail interaction in January allowed us to update each other; he told me the news about the Narae City Council and the economy, and I told him about the progress with my dissertation.

I realized over e-mail that Keigo and I were talking past each other. My latest update to Keigo had been about progress with municipality’s cultural landscape preservation project, which I was involved in as a surveyor/researcher for the Narae City
government since the summer of 2010. As the national Agency for Cultural Affairs
determined the cultural landscape preservation project to be a mandatory component of
Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project, officials from the three layers of public
administration (municipal, prefectural, and national) understood that their municipalities
would no longer be included as part of the World Heritage project if they failed to
register the local landscape as national cultural heritage property. As a news editor,
Keigo rarely missed observing the city council sessions. I assumed that he must have
information on the progress with Narae’s cultural landscape preservation project, and
asked him about it in the e-mail. In his response, Keigo wrote neither about the progress
with the cultural landscape preservation project, nor about the city council. Instead, he
informed me that the municipal officials finally finished explaining the World Heritage
nomination project to the congregations of the local Catholic churches. He stated that he
thought there were no “nays” to the project from the Catholics.

At some level, Keigo and I were not communicating effectively, but concurrently
at another level, we were. Keigo did not answer my question insofar as he did not
directly mention anything about the legal progress with the cultural landscape
preservation project. I was wondering whether or not the city council would have
approved the project to proceed to the national level, or whether or not the municipal
officials had even finished writing their preservation proposal for the legislative review.
Even though I did not literally write “World Heritage” in my e-mail, my question to
Keigo concerned the legal aspect of the World Heritage nomination project. The cultural
landscape preservation project was just a part of the World Heritage nomination project.
Keigo interpreted my question and provided me with information on a different aspect of
the World Heritage nomination project: the efforts of the municipal officials to explain the World Heritage project to local stakeholders. Even though Keigo and I were talking about two different things, those two things were connected through an index: the term *World Heritage*. We were also talking about the same thing. We were both talking about the translation processes of the World Heritage Convention. Keigo was talking about community participation, while I was concerned with the legal process. What Keigo and I were talking about were the different segments of legal translation and legal transformation.

*An Indexical Guessing Game*

Identifying the details of which Japanese laws would be associated with their World Heritage project and how they could connect those two legal systems with local social contexts was decidedly not intuitive for Keigo, as well as for municipal officials and residents in Narae and in other municipalities around Nagasaki. The municipal local officials struggled to figure out the details of multiple legal systems, and also to connect legal conventions with contexts. While I was conducting my fieldwork and while I was working for the municipal government’s cultural landscape preservation project, Keigo and I frequently talked about the legal complexities of Nagasaki’s World Heritage nomination project. Keigo and I shared the sense that the officials were struggling to learn what World Heritage meant while concurrently engaging in preparing the official nomination and explaining the project to the local residents. Consequently, the local officials were not only confused but also lost while they were trying to communicate with the local residents about the World Heritage nomination project. The confusion of
the officials was also reflected in the local media. Local reporters – including Keigo – had to produce news articles about the World Heritage nomination project, but were confused by officials’ explanations of it. Instead of building a smooth and ideal logical linkage between the World Heritage Convention and the lived contexts of the local residents in Narae and in the rest of Nagasaki prefecture, the endless indexical guessing games among the local stakeholders deconstructed the World Heritage Convention into irreparable fragments.

While the nomination project seemed not to be moving forward, some of the officials – particularly from the prefectural government – attempted to present a legally aesthetic assemblage of the World Heritage nomination project process. By preparing legal proof – such as arranging consent from the leader of the religious corporation (the local Catholic diocese) and by hosting World Heritage symposia, those officials tried to immediately respond to take advantage of the confusion engendered by the World Heritage indexical guessing game. Since the initial submission of their proposal in 2006, the officials of the Nagasaki prefectural government immediately engaged in working with a so-called “public” organization in a partial attempt to provide proof of civic involvement. Such immediate responses were documented and stored in their administrative archives as official legal proof to justify their efforts for the nomination.

Such legally archived data was loaded with words and phrases that matched with those in UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention, and could function to justify the efforts of officials to accommodate the participation of the local residents in the decision-making process. In this process, the World Heritage Convention was translated by some of the public officials, and transformed for the sake of limited number of
stakeholders. While it sounded administratively compelling, however, the conventional meaning had only corresponded with the contextual meaning of a few local stakeholders. Yet, the World Heritage Convention had not corresponded with the context of those located outside of a limited local interest group. Ironically, such translation relays among prefectural officials and stakeholders placed the municipal officials – who were at the bottom of this translation relay chain – to be those who would struggle to bridge the already transformed World Heritage Convention with the lived reality of the local residents in their municipality.

*Not Alarming, Not Dramatic: Communicating World Heritage*

In such a discursive environment, a World Heritage nomination project is actually a tedious and technical process. The power struggle took place at the level of word selection. It was not as dramatic as a sudden economic boom or an alarming economic decline. The World Heritage nomination project was not dramatic enough to take over the front page of even local newspapers. It showed up once in a while as a small article in a local section of a newspaper, without much detailed information. The process of the World Heritage nomination, as any other implementation process of international policy, is subtle but not dramatic. However, it is a lengthy, technical process involving syntax and indices and the preparation of corresponding administrative venues. The implementation process was not only not dramatic enough for news broadcasts, but also too lengthy, too vague and too complex to hold the attention of the audience. In this sense, mass-mediated communication was not a suitable channel for the World Heritage nomination project.
However, it did not automatically mean that the local residents only wanted dramatic news about the World Heritage nomination process. They were demanding to be a part of the nomination project. As the local public administration was trying to prepare a locally-particular cultural preservation ordinance, questions from local residents were also regionally or individually specific: e.g. the specific effects of regulations on their economic activities, landscape maintenance, or housing maintenance. They want detailed answers from the officials and they wanted their voices to be counted in the process. However, such information was too specific to disseminate through a mass-mediated information network. Instead, it required more personal and interactive communication exchange: direct personal communication between the officials and the local residents.

When I started working as a surveyor/researcher for Narae municipal government’s cultural landscape preservation project in June 2010, I was personally shocked by a radical change of behavior in one of the local residents. Joji, who used to serve as a representative of his administrative district in Narae city, behaved completely to me differently than he previously had been. He was no longer opinionated or aggressive. Instead, during a community board meeting, he was quiet and polite, and no longer verbally attacked the officials during the meeting. I was surprised by how different Joji was. He told me that while I was away in China, the municipal officials arranged regular meetings with the residents in his district not only to explain the progress of the World Heritage nomination project, but also to ask their input for the project (conversation with author, June 7, 2010).
It seemed that the effective and strategic use of different communication channels both from government and public spheres was vital to align multiple indices which lie in-between international conventions and local contexts. What is documented and recorded are partial segments of the indexical connections, and careful editing could conceal the messiness behind the document preparation process. From a communicative perspective, one of several aspects of law is to provide an avenue for smooth interpersonal communication. By following rules, individuals can effectively interact with one another and properly interpret the messages of their counterparts.
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